



राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्यशासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

खण्ड 41]

शिमला, शनिवार, 23 जनवरी, 1993/3 माघ, 1914

[संख्या 4

| | विषय सूची | |
|-------|---|---------|
| भाग 1 | वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़ कर हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल और हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि | 96—129 |
| भाग 2 | वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़ कर विभिन्न विभागों के अध्यक्षों और जिला मैजिस्ट्रेटों द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि | 130—136 |
| भाग 3 | अधिनियम, विधेयक और विधेयकों पर प्रवर समिति के प्रतिवेदन, वैधानिक नियम तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट, फाईनैन्शियल कमिशनर तथा कमिशनर आफ इन्कम टैक्स द्वारा अधिसूचित आदेश इत्यादि | 136—138 |
| भाग 4 | स्थानीय स्वायत्त शासन, म्युनिसिपल बोर्ड, डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड, नोटिफाइड और टाउन एरिया तथा पंचायती राज विभाग | — |
| भाग 5 | वैयक्तिक अधिसूचनाएं और विज्ञापन | 139—146 |
| भाग 6 | भारतीय राजपत्र इत्यादि में से पुनः प्रकाशन | — |
| भाग 7 | भारतीय निर्वाचन आयोग (Election Commission of India) की वैधानिक अधिसूचनाएं तथा अन्य निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी अधिसूचनाएं | — |
| — | अनुपूरक | — |

23 जनवरी, 1993/3 माघ, 1914 को समाप्त होने वाले सप्ताह में निम्नलिखित विज्ञप्तियां 'समाचारण राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश' में प्रकाशित हुईं :—

| विज्ञप्ति की संख्या | विभाग का नाम | विषय |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| संख्या पी० सी० एन०-एम० एन० डी०-ए० (4) 80/92, दिनांक 1 जनवरी, 1993. | कार्यालय उपायुक्त जिला मण्डी | श्री तारा चन्द, पंच, ग्राम पंचायत बाल्ही, विकास खण्ड गोहर, जिला मण्डी को ग्राम पंचायत नियमावली, 1971 के नियम 77 के अन्तर्गत कारण बताओ नोटिस। |
| संख्या पी० बी० डब्ल्यू० (बी०) 15-14/83-1, दिनांक 6 जनवरी, 1993. | नगरे एवं ग्राम योजना विभाग | शिमला विकास प्राधिकरण के गठन की अधिसूचना इसके अंग्रेजी रूपान्तर सहित। |
| No. Fin.-2-C (2) 1/77 (W & M) 3257-3443, dated 7th January, 1993. | Finance Department | Acceptance of resignation of Dr. Rajan Sushant from the post of Vice-Chairman of National Savings State Advisory Board. |
| संख्या जी० ए० बी०-1 ए० (4)-4/90, दिनांक 7 जनवरी, 1993. | सामान्य प्रशासन विभाग | जिला स्तर पर गठित अन्तोदय, विकास एवं लोक शिकायत निवारण समिति के पुनर्गठन हेतु अधिसूचना। |
| No. 6-88/92-Tpt. (Sectt) dated 14th January, 1993 | Transport Department | Re-constitution of the Board of Directors of Himachal Pradesh Transport Corporation. |
| संख्या ई० एक्स० एन० एफ० (10) 2/83 दिनांक 18 जनवरी, 1993. | आबकारी एवं कराधान विभाग | परवाणू सेक्टर-4, नवगांव, गुल्लरवाली तथा दो सड़का (नाहन पोस्टा सड़क पर) चक पोस्ट/बैरियर की स्थापना हेतु अधिसूचना का इसका अंग्रेजी रूपान्तर सहित प्रकाशन। |

भाग 1--प्रशासनिक नियमों को छोड़ कर हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल और हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि

हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट

NOTIFICATION

Shimla, the 2nd January, 1993

No. HHC/Admn.6-20/77-XI-315-90.—In continuation of this Court notification of even No., dated 26th October, 1992, the Hon'ble the Chief Justice is pleased to nominate Hon'ble Mr. Justice Devinder Gupta, Hon'ble Mr. Justice D. P. Sood and Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. S. Panta as vacation Judges to hear matters of urgent nature during the period set out below :—

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Devinder Gupta 18-1-1993 to 31-1-1993.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. S. Panta 1-2-1993 to 14-2-1993.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice D. P. Sood 15-2-1993 to 28-2-1993.

The vacation court sittings for urgent matters shall be as under :—

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Devinder Gupta 22-1-1993 and 29-1-1993

Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. S. Panta 5-2-1993 and 12-2-1993.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice D. P. Sood 18-2-1993 and 26-2-1993.

(19th February, 1993 being holiday on account of Maha Shivratri).

By order,

K. C. SOOD,
Registrar.

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार

कार्मिक विभाग (नि-1)

अधिसूचनाएं

शिमला-2, 2 जनवरी, 1993

संख्या का 0 (नि-1) वी (5)-7/73-भाग-II.—भारत के राष्ट्रपति महोदय को सूचित करते हैं कि श्री वी 0 प्रार 0 कैथन, निलाश्री सोहन क म्हा 0 अधिसूचना (प्रकाश रिजर्व), जो नि हिमाचल प्रदेश प्रशासनिक सेवा में पूर्णकालीन अस्थायी तौर पर परदेसी है, अधिसूचना को प्राप्ति पूर्ण करने पर दिनांक 31-8-1993 (अगस्त) को सेवा निवृत्त होंगे।

आदेश द्वारा,

मधु सुदन मुखर्जी,
मुख्य सचिव।

शिमला-2, 4 जनवरी, 1993

संख्या का 0 (नि-1) वी (3)-2/75-खण्ड-2.—इस विभाग की समसमयक अधिसूचना, दिनांक 28 दिसम्बर, 1992 का आगिक संगोपन करते हुए भारत के राष्ट्रपति महोदय को सूचित करते हैं कि श्री बजराम शर्मा, भा 0 प्र 0 से 0, अस्थायी एवं निदेशक, रोजगार, हिमाचल प्रदेश के दिनांक 4-1-1993 से 5-2-1993 तक अगित अवकाश के दौरान श्री अमर नाथ शर्मा, भा 0 प्र 0 से 0, अस्थायी एवं निदेशक, रोजगार, हिमाचल प्रदेश के पद का कार्यभार अगले आदेशों तक देखेंगे।

हस्ताक्षरित,
अस्थायी एवं सचिव।

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-2, the 27th January, 1988

No. Agr-B-12 (1) 87-II.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the postings of the 14 Agriculture Inspectors promoted as Class-II (Gazetted) Officers on *ad hoc* basis *vide* this Department Notification of even No., dated the 21st January, 1988 as under with immediate effect:—

1. Shri Yash Pal Singh SMS (PP), Dharamshala Verma.
2. Shri Magan Swaroop SMS (Veg.), Palampur Sharma.
3. Shri Jai Parkash SMS (Soil & WM), Palampur. Sharma.
4. Shri Jagpal Singh SMS (Agronomy), Sundernagar. Verma.
5. Shri Jatinder Kumar SMS (PP), Mandi Kapuria.
6. Shri Kirpal Singh SMS (PP), Sundernagar Chauhan.
7. Shri Rakshpal Singh SMS (Veg.), Mandi Chaudhry.
8. Shri Ram Baboo Lal SMS (Farm Economics), Mandi.
9. Shri Mahesh Chander SMS (Soil, and (WM), Mandi. Dixit.
10. Shri Naresh Kumar SMS (Agronomy), Shimla.
11. Shri Satya Pal Singh SMS (Farm Economics), Shimla.
12. Shri Dalbir Singh SMS (Soil & WM), Shimla.
13. Shri S. K. Verma SMS (PP), Keylong.
14. Shri Aziz Ahmad Asstt. Seed Officer, Certification Quarashi. Palampur.

Shimla-2, the 15th February, 1988

No. Agr. B (3) 7/84.—In partial modification of this Department notification of even number, dated 11-12-1987, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the posting of Shri Hari Ram Noor as Subject Matter Specialist (FP) I. A. D. P., Palampur, District Kangra till 31-3-1988 against a vacant post in the public interest with immediate effect.

Shimla-2, the 14th February, 1988

No. Agr. B (3) 7/87.—In supersession of this Department notification of even number, dated the 11th January, 1988, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the transfer of Shri Harbir Singh, Assistant Soil Conservation Officer, from Hamirpur to Nalagarh, District Solan as Assistant Soil Conservation Officer

against a vacant post in the public interest with immediate effect.

2. The Governor, is further pleased to order that Shri L. S. Mastana, Soil Testing Officer, Hamirpur will look after the work of Assistant Soil Conservation Officer, Hamirpur in addition to his own duties till further orders.

Shimla-2, the 22nd February, 1988

No. Agr. A-4-5/85.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh in consultation with Vidhan Sabha Secretariat is pleased to nominate Shri M. R. Goma, M. L. A., as Member of Himachal Pradesh Seed Potato Development Board reconstituted vide this Department Notification of even number, dated 16-10-1985.

By order,
S. M. KANWAR,
F. C.-cum-Secretary.

ANIMAL HUSBANDRY DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 12th February, 1988

No. Ahy. B (2)-2/82.—On the recommendations of the Departmental Promotion Committee, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to promote Shri Rajinder Kumar, Superintendent, Grade-III (Non-Gazetted) as Superintendent, Grade-I (Class-II, Gazetted) in the pay scale of Rs. 825—1580 in the Directorate of Animal Husbandry, Himachal Pradesh with immediate effect.

2. Shri Rajinder Kumar will be on probation for a period of two years.

By order,
S. M. KANWAR,
A. P. C.-cum-Secretary.

विभागीय परीक्षा बोर्ड

अधिसूचनाएं

फेयर लान्ज, शिमला-171012, 12 जनवरी, 1993

संख्या हिप्पा (परीक्षा) 21/76-4.—आवकारी एवं कराधान विभाग, हिमाचल प्रदेश के आवकारी तथा कराधान निरीक्षकों की विभागीय परीक्षा निम्न विवरणिका के अनुसार हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक प्रशासन संस्थान, फेयर लान्ज, शिमला-171012, में दिनांक 30-4-1993 से 4-5-1993 तक आयोजित की जा रही है। इस परीक्षा का आयोजन हिमाचल प्रदेश आवकारी तथा कराधान विभाग के आवकारी एवं कराधान निरीक्षकों के नियम, 1978 के अन्तर्गत किया जा रहा है।

| क्रम संख्या | दिनांक | दिन | सत्र, | चों के नाम |
|-------------|-----------|----------|----------------|--|
| 1. | 30-4-1993 | शुक्रवार | प्रातः सायं | ला आ फ कर्डिमज एकसाईज ला |
| 2. | 1-5-1993 | शनिवार | प्रातः सायं | ला रिलेटिंग टू अलाईड टैक्सिज प्रापर्टी टैक्स ला एण्ड प्रेक्टिस एण्ड सिविल लाज। |
| 3. | 3-5-1993 | सोमवार | प्रातः सायं | सलज टैक्स ला एण्ड प्रेक्टिस बुक कीपिंग एण्ड जनरल कमशियल नालेज। |
| 4. | 4-5-1993 | मंगलवार | प्रातः | लण्डा सक्रुष्ट (अमरीतनरी या महाजनी)। |

समस्त इच्छुक उम्मीदवारों को यह सूचित किया जाता है कि प्रतिदिन प्रातः का सत्र ठीक 10.00 बजे और सायं का सत्र ठीक 2.00 बजे (बाद दोपहर) आरम्भ होगा। जो उम्मीदवार विभागीय परीक्षा में बैठना चाहते हों वे अपने आवेदन-पत्र निर्धारित प्रपत्र पर अपने विभागाध्यक्ष के माध्यम से प्रपत्र क भाग II पर अपनी पात्रता सत्यापित करवा के सचिव, हिमाचल प्रदेश विभागीय परीक्षा बोर्ड, फेयर लान्ज, शिमला-12 को प्रेषित करें जो कि बोर्ड के कार्यालय में हर हाल में दिनांक 31-3-1993 तक पहुँच जाने चाहिए अन्यथा देर से प्राप्त हुए आवेदन-पत्रों को स्वीकार नहीं किया जा सकेगा और न ही रोल नम्बर जारी किये जा सकेंगे।

निर्धारित आवेदन पत्र नियन्त्रक, मुद्रण एवं लेबन सामग्री विभाग, हिमाचल प्रदेश, घोड़ा चौकी, शिमला-171005 में प्रदायी पर प्राप्त किये जा सकते हैं।

अब क्योंकि विभागीय परीक्षाओं का समस्त कार्य संगणक (कम्प्यूटर) द्वारा किया जा रहा है, इसलिए आवेदक यह सुनिश्चित करें कि वे अपना नाम, जन्म तिथि, कार्यक स्थान, पिन कोड सहित बड़े अक्षरों में साफ व शुद्ध लिखें। जो उम्मीदवारों ने इससे पूर्व विभागीय परीक्षा क जो पत्र उत्तीर्ण कर लिए हों उनका भी पूर्ण विवरण प्रेषित करें, मत्र एवं रोल नम्बर आदि का सही व्योरा दें।

फेयर लान्ज, शिमला-171012, जनवरी 2, 1993

संख्या हिप्पा (परीक्षा) 21/76-4.—भारतीय प्रशासनिक सेवा/हिमाचल प्रदेश प्रशासनिक सेवा, तहसीलदार/नायब तहसीलदार तथा राज्य में कार्यरत अन्य समस्त राजपत्रित अधिकारी जिनके लिए विभागीय परीक्षा पास करना अनिवार्य है, क लिए विभागीय परीक्षा निम्न विवरणिका के अनुसार हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक प्रशासन संस्थान, फेयर लान्ज, शिमला-171012 में दिनांक 26 अप्रैल, 1993 से 3 मई, 1993 तक

अप्योजित की जा रही है। इन परीक्षाओं का आयोजन हिमाचल प्रदेश विभागीय परीक्षा निम, 1976 जो कि समय-समय पर संशोधित किये गये हैं के अन्तर्गत किया जायेगा :-

| क्रम संख्या | दिनांक | दिन | सत्र | भारतीय प्रशासनिक सेवा अधिकारी | हिमाचल प्रदेश प्रशासनिक सेवा अधिकारी | अन्य राजपत्रित अधिकारी | | तहसीलदार | नायब तहसीलदार |
|-------------|-----------|----------|--------|---|---|--|--------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| | | | | | | तकनीकी अधिकारी | गैर-तकनीकी अधिकारी | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1. | 26-4-1993 | सोमवार | प्रातः | — | सामान्य प्रशासन | वित्तीय प्रशासन | वित्तीय प्रशासन | लोकल फण्ड ट्रेजरी एण्ड फाईनेन्शियल क्लर्क। | — |
| | | माय | | हिन्दी | हिन्दी | हिन्दी | हिन्दी | हिन्दी | हिन्दी |
| 2. | 27-4-1993 | मंगलवार | प्रातः | — | योजना एवं विकास। | पेपर-3 सम्बन्धित विभागों के लिए क्लर्क एण्ड ऐक्टस। | पेपर-3 | लोकल एण्ड स्पेशियल लाज। | — |
| | | माय | | — | कन्सटीच्यूशन एण्ड सिविल लाज। | — | पेपर-4 | रैवेन्यू केस | — |
| 3. | 28-4-1993 | बुधवार | प्रातः | कुमीनल ला एण्ड प्रोसीजर। | कुमीनल ला एण्ड प्रोसीजर। | — | पेपर-5 | लैण्ड रैवेन्यू ऐक्टस एण्ड क्लर्क। | लैण्ड रैवेन्यू ऐक्टस एण्ड क्लर्क। |
| | | माय | | कुमीनल केस | कुमीनल केस | — | — | अरिथमेटिक एण्ड पेटवारीज मैनमरेशन। | अरिथमेटिक एण्ड पेटवारीज मैनमरेशन। |
| 4. | 29-4-1993 | बुधवार | प्रातः | रैवेन्यू ला एण्ड प्रोसीजर। | रैवेन्यू ला एण्ड प्रोसीजर। | — | — | माईनर रैवेन्यू ऐक्टस एण्ड क्लर्क। | माईनर रैवेन्यू ऐक्टस एण्ड क्लर्क। |
| | | माय | | रैवेन्यू केस। | रैवेन्यू केस। | — | — | कुमीनल ला एण्ड प्रोसीजर। | कुमीनल ला एण्ड प्रोसीजर। |
| 5. | 30-4-1993 | शुक्रवार | प्रातः | सिविल सर्विस ट्रेजरी एण्ड फाईनेन्शियल क्लर्क। | सिविल सर्विस ट्रेजरी एण्ड फाईनेन्शियल क्लर्क। | — | — | — | — |
| | | माय | | स्पेशियल ऐक्टस (कुमीनल) मैनमरेशन एण्ड क्लर्क। | स्पेशियल ऐक्टस (कुमीनल) मैनमरेशन एण्ड क्लर्क। | — | — | — | — |
| 6. | 1-5-1993 | शनिवार | प्रातः | माईनर (रैवेन्यू) ऐक्टस एण्ड मैनमरेशन। | माईनर (रैवेन्यू) ऐक्टस एण्ड मैनमरेशन। | — | — | — | — |
| | | माय | | मोटर मर्कैजिज एण्ड ड्राईविंग। | मोटर मर्कैजिज एण्ड ड्राईविंग। | — | — | — | — |
| 7. | 3-5-1993 | मंगलवार | प्रातः | — | टारगेट कृटिंग (राईफल एण्ड रिवाल्वर)। | — | — | — | — |
| | | माय | | होम राईडिंग | होम राईडिंग | — | — | — | — |

समस्त इच्छुक उम्मीदवारों को यह भी सूचित किया जाता है कि प्रतिदिन प्रातः का सत्र ठीक 10.00 बजे और साय का सत्र ठीक 2.00 बजे (बाद दोपहर) आरम्भ होगा। जो उम्मीदवार विभागीय परीक्षा में बैठना चाहते हैं व अपने आवेदन-पत्र निर्धारित प्रपत्र पर अपने-अपने विभागाध्यक्षों के माध्यम से प्रपत्र के भाग II पर अपनी पात्रता सत्यापित करवा के सचिव, हिमाचल प्रदेश

विभागीय परीक्षा बोर्ड, फेयर लांज, शिमला-171012 को प्रेषित करें जो कि इस कार्यालय में हर हालत में दिनांक 31 मार्च, 1993 तक पहुंच जाने चाहिए। अन्यथा आवेदन-पत्र स्वीकार नहीं किये जा सकेंगे और न ही होल नम्बर जारी किये जा सकेंगे।

निर्धारित आवेदन-पत्र फार्म, नियन्त्रक, मुद्रण एवं लेखन सामग्री विभाग, हिमाचल प्रदेश, घांड़ा चौकी, शिमला-171005 के विप्रेषण डिपॉ से अदायगी पर प्राप्त किये जा सकते हैं।

अब क्योंकि विभागीय परीक्षाओं का समस्त कार्य संगणक (कम्प्यूटर) द्वारा किया जा रहा है, इसलिए आवेदक यह मतिजित करे कि वे अपना नाम, जन्म तिथि, कार्य का स्थान, पिन कोड नम्बर सहित बड़े अक्षरों में साफ व शुद्ध लिखें। जिन उम्मीदवारों ने इससे पूर्व विभागीय परीक्षाओं के जो पत्रों/पत्रों उत्तीर्ण कर लिए हैं उनका भी वर्ण विवरण अर्थात् वर, सत्र एवं रोल नम्बर आदि का सही ब्योरा दें।

हस्ताक्षरित/
सचिव।

FISHERIES DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 5th January, 1993

No. FSH-C(17)-1/93.—Whereas it appears to the Government of Himachal Pradesh that land is required to be taken by the Government at the public expense for a public purpose, namely for the renovation and augmentation of water supply at Trout Rearing Unit, Nagni, Tehsil Banjar, District Kullu, Himachal Pradesh it is hereby notified that the land in the locality described below is likely to be required for the above purpose.

2. This notification is made under the provisions of section 4 of the land Acquisition Act, 1894 to all whom it may concern.

3. In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section. The president of India is pleased to authorise the Officers for the time being engaged in undertaking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey the land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by the section.

4. Any person interested, who has any objection to the acquisition of any land in the locality may within thirty days of the publication of this notification file an objection in writing before the S. D. O. (Civil), Banjar, Sub-Division Banjar, District Kullu, Himachal Pradesh.

SPECIFICATION

| District : KULU | | Tehsil : BANJAR |
|-----------------|------------|-------------------|
| Village | Khasra No. | Area Big. Bis. |
| Fati Mauja | 509 | 0-2 |
| Sharchi | 511 | 0-16 |
| Total | .. | 0-18 |

By order.
Sd/-

Financial Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

FOOD AND SUPPLIES DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 21st January, 1988

No. FDS B(2)-2-4/87.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, on the recommendations of the Departmental Promotion Committee is pleased to promote Shri D. N. Bhanot, Superintendent Grade-III as Superintendent Grade-I in the pay scale of Rs. 825—1580 (Class-II) Gazetted on officiating basis, with immediate effect with Headquarters at Shimla in the Directorate of Food and Supplies, Himachal Pradesh.

The promotion of the aforesaid official is without prejudice to the final decision of the Hon'ble High

Court (now Administrative Tribunal) of Himachal Pradesh in CWP 727 of 1984.

By order,

S. S. SIDHU,
Commissioner-cum-Secretary (F&S).

FINANCE (REGULATION) DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-2, the 13th January, 1988

No. Fin.(C)-A(2)-1/84-II.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order that all the Dy. Commissioners in Himachal Pradesh shall function as Disbursing Officers under the following Head of Account with immediate effect :

- “2403—Animal Husbandry.
- 107—Fodder and Feed Development
- 02—Supply of Urea for the Development of Fodder Grass under drought relief measures (Plan) Grant-in-Aid/Subsidy/Contribution.”

B. C. GUPTA,
Dy. Secretary.

शिमला-2, 1 जनवरी, 1993

संख्या फिन(सी)ए(2)-1/89.—इन विभाग द्वारा जारी की गई अधिसूचना संख्या फिन (सी)ए(2)-1/82, दिनांक 1-8-1991 का अधिक्रमण करते हुए भारत के राष्ट्रपति, अध्यक्ष, हिमाचल प्रदेश उपभोक्ता, विवाद प्रतिरोध आयोग के स्थान पर निदेशक, खाद्य एवं आपूर्ति, हिमाचल प्रदेश को निम्नलिखित लेखाशीर्ष के अन्तर्गत तत्काल से विभागाध्यक्ष घोषित करने के सहित आदेश प्रदान करते हैं :—

| | |
|--------------|-------------------------|
| मुख्य शीर्ष | 2408—खाद्य एवं मालगोदाम |
| उप-शीर्ष | 01—खाद्य |
| लघु शीर्ष | 001—निदेशन एवं प्रशासन |
| उप-लघु शीर्ष | 02—जिला कमचारी फॉर्म |

आदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-
आयुक्त एवं सचिव (वित्त)।

FOREST FARMING & CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-2, the 26th December, 1987

No. 6-2/73-SF-IV.—In exercise of the powers conferred under Section 4(1) of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased

to appoint the Chief Conservator of Forests (P&D) to act as Chief Wild Life Warden, Himachal Pradesh and the Additional Chief Conservator of Forests (Wild Life) to act as Wild Life Warden, Himachal Pradesh with immediate effect.

Shimla-2, the 29th December, 1987

No. Fts. I(B)6-2/87 (Estt)-Trans. (Pt.).—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order the following transfers and postings of HPFS-II Officers in the Department of Forest Farming and Conservation, with immediate effect, in the public interest:—

| Sl. No. | Name of Officer | From | To |
|---------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| 1. | Sh. J. K. Plah, HPFS-II. | Under orders of transfer from Hydro-Electric Project Chamera in Chamba District, to Bhadroya Sal Depot. | He is retained at Chamba in Hydro-Electric Project Chamera up to 31-8-1988, for one year. |
| 2. | Sh. J. S. Pathania, HPFS-II. | Under orders of transfer from IGDP Palampur to Chamera Project, Chamba. | A. C. F. Palampur Forest Division vice Sh. Piar Chand Sharma. |
| 3. | Sh. Piar Chand Sharma, HPFS-II. | A.C.F. Palampur Ft. Division. | Services placed at the disposal of the Indo German Dhau-ladhar Project Palampur on deputation basis on usual terms and conditions, vice Sh. J. S. Pathania, A. C. F. |

By order,

S. S. SIDHU,
Secretary (Forests).

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-171002, the 29th December, 1987

No. GAD E(F)4-2/87.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to constitute the Selection Committee at Rajya Sainik Board level for implementation of Self Employment Scheme for Ex-servicemen (SEMFEX) in Himachal Pradesh, as under:—

- | | | |
|----|---|-------------------|
| 1. | Managing Director, State Financial Corporation .. | Convenor |
| 2. | Representative of IDBI .. | Member |
| 3. | Representative of participating Bank .. | -do- |
| 4. | Secretary, Rajya Sainik Board .. | Member-Secretary. |

2. There will be no quorum for the meeting of the Committee. The functions of the Committee will be as under:—

- Evaluation of the Entrepreneur as to his capability to set up and run the project.
- Guide and advise the entrepreneur, if necessary regarding modification in the project.
- Arrange EDP training for the entrepreneur, if considered necessary.

B. C. NEGI,
Chief Secretary.

Shimla-171002, the 13th January, 1988

No. GAD-E(B)3-1/85.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to allow Late Shri Jagat Bhashan, Ex-Zila Sainik Welfare Officer, Chamba, Himachal Pradesh to cross the efficiency bar at the stage of Rs. 1200/- in the pay scale of Rs. 940-30-1000-40-1200/50-1400/60-1700-75-1850, thereby raising his pay to Rs. 1500/- per month with effect from 1st June, 1987.

P. S. RANA,
Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

HOME DEPARTMENT

(Section-D)

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-171002, the 23rd December, 1987

No. Home-D(B-1)-38/71.—In partial modification of this Government notification even number, dated the 6th October, 1987 the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to cancel the posting of Shri Rajeev Dube to Kangra District upon his selection for appointment to the I. A. S.

B. C. NEGI,
Chief Secretary.

Shimla-171002, the 31st December, 1987

No. HOME(A-B)(2)-5/80.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, on the recommendations of the Departmental Promotion Committee, is pleased to order the promotion of Shri R. D. Kashyap, Superintendent Grade-II to the post of Superintendent Grade-I, in the pay scale of Rs. 825—1580 in the office of Director General of Police, Himachal Pradesh with immediate effect.

By order,

Sd/-
Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

Shimla-171002, the 8th January, 1988

No. 1-22/71-Home(B) Judl.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under the provisions of Article 233(1) of the Constitution of India, and in consultation with the High Court of Himachal Pradesh, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to appoint Shri Raj Kishore Gupta, Advocate, 303-A, Pocket II, Mayur Vihar, Phase I, Delhi-92, to the Himachal Pradesh Higher Judicial Services as a direct recruit with effect from the date of his assuming charge at the place to which he may be posted by the High Court.

Shimla-171002, the 8th January, 1988

No. Home (B)1-22/71-Judl.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under the provisions of Article 233(1) of the Constitution of India and in consultation with the High Court of Himachal Pradesh the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to appoint Sarvshri Surjeet Singh and Janeshwar Goel, Members of Himachal Pradesh Judicial Service to the Himachal Pradesh Higher Judicial Service with immediate effect subject to the decision of the Supreme Court in C. W. P. No. 910 of

1987, titled *Shrimati Kiran Aggarwal Vs. State of H. P. and others.*

HORTICULTURE DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-171002, the 11th January, 1988

No. Home (B)1-22/71-Judl.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under the provisions of Article 233(1) of the Constitution of India and in consultation with the High Court of Himachal Pradesh the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to appoint Shri B. S. Chauhan, Member of Himachal Pradesh Judicial Service to the Himachal Pradesh Higher Judicial Service with immediate effect subject to the decision of the Supreme Court in C. W. P. No. 910 of 1987, titled *Shrimati Kiran Aggarwal Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh and others.*

KANWAR SHAMSHER SINGH,
Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

Shimla-171002, the 18th January, 1988

No. Home-II(B)2-3/80.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to relieve Shri M. R. Chaudhary, Assistant Advocate General, office of the Advocate General, Himachal Pradesh with immediate effect, consequent upon his appointment to the Himachal Pradesh Higher Judicial Service as a direct recruit and posting as Additional District and Sessions Judge (I), Kangra at Dharamshala.

By order
KANWAR SHAMSHER SINGH,
Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

Shimla-2, the 24/26th December, 1987

No. Udyan-Kha(2)8/87.—On the recommendations of the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to appoint Shri Narender Lal Shah, Horticultural Officer, Kangra as Deputy Director Horticulture in the pay scale of Rs. 1200—1850 (Class-I) Gazetted.

He shall be on probation for a period of two years from the date of joining his duty and his confirmation after successful completion of the probationary period will depend upon the availability of permanent post.

Shimla-2, the 26th December, 1987

No. Udyan-Kha (2) 8/87.—In continuation of this department Notification of even number, dated 24th December, 1987, regarding appointment order of Shri Narender Lal Shah as Deputy Director (Horticulture) the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the posting of Shri Narender Lal Shah, Deputy Director (Horticulture) as Subject Matter Specialist (Floriculture) Shimla under T & V Project in the pay scale of Rs. 1200—1850 (Class-I) Gazetted from the date of his taking over the charge of the post.

By order,
S. M. KANWAR,
Secretary.

HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-2, the 30th May, 1986

No. Health-B(9)-2/83.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, on the recommendation of Departmental Promotion Committee is pleased to promote the following H.P.H.S. Grade-II of H.P.H.S. as H.P.H.S. Grade-I in the pay scale of Rs 1400-60-1700/75-2000 from the date they take over as such at the place of posting shown against each:—

| Sl.No. | Name of Doctor | Present place of posting | New place of posting | Remarks |
|--------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. | Dr. Shree Niwas Sharma | CHC Jawali | PHC Dadasiba, District Kangra | |
| 2. | Dr. Jaspal Singh Mehta | Kamla Nehru Hospital, Shimla. | DH Sundernagar, District Mandi | |
| 3. | Dr. (Mrs) Surindera Sharma | District Hosp. Bilaspur | District Hosp. Bilaspur | |
| 4. | Dr. (Mrs) Amrawati Santoshi | Ripon Hosp. Shimla | Ripon Hospital, Shimla | |
| 5. | Dr. Vijay Kumar Kapoor | District Hosp. Mandi | Distt. Hosp. Mandi. | |
| 6. | Dr. Kewal Krishan Sharma | CD Jaishingpur (Kangra) | PHC Chadjar, District Kangra | |
| 7. | Dr. (Miss) Priya Malhotra | DH Mandi | DH Mandi | |
| 8. | Dr. Harmohan Singh | DH Solan | CH Rajgarh, District Sirmur | |
| 9. | Dr. (Miss) Brij Bala Sharma | DH Chamba | PHC Pukhari, District Chamba | |
| 10. | Dr. (Mrs) Radha Chopra | PHC Dharampur District Solan. | PHC Dharampur, District Solan | |
| 11. | Dr. Kishore Chand Sharma | DH Mandi | DH Mandi | |
| 12. | Dr. Rajinder Kumar Puri | TB Sanitarium Dharampur | CHC Haroli, District Una | |
| 13. | Dr. Ram Lal Sharma | CH Rohroo, Distt. Shimla | CH Rohroo, District Shimla | |
| 14. | Dr. Kulwant Singh Katoch | CH Palampur | CH Chowari, Distt. Chamba | |
| 15. | Dr. (Mrs) Urmil Jamwal | RH Rampur, Distt. Shimla | RH Rampur, Distt. Shimla | |
| 16. | Dr. Satpal Singh Thakur | DH Hamirpur | DH Hamirpur | |
| 17. | Dr. Ram Pal Vashisht | DH Una | CHC Barsar (Hamirpur) | |
| 18. | Dr. (Mrs) Pritma S. Thakur | DH Hamirpur | DH Hamirpur | |
| 19. | Dr. Madan Lal Gupta | DH Bilaspur | CHC Arki | |
| 20. | Dr. Uttam Chand Parwan | IG Medical College, Shimla | CH Chopal, Distt. Shimla | |
| 21. | Dr. Chaudhary Ram Thakur | CD Nagwain | CHC Jogindernagar, Distt. Mandi | |
| 22. | Dr. Ishwar Dass Sood | CD Khanaria, Distt. Kangra | CH Garli | |
| 23. | Dr. Satinder Kumar Gupta | DH Mandi | PHC Ratti (Mandi) | |
| 24. | Dr. (Mrs) Prem Saxena | Kamla Nehru Hosp. Shimla. | Kamla Nehru Hosp. Shimla | |
| 25. | Dr. Suresh Kumar Sharma | On deputation in Advance Study. | Advance Study on deputation | |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-----|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 26. | Dr. (Mrs) Usha Kiran Prashar | Distt. Hosp. Kullu | PHC Mashobra (Shimla) | |
| 27. | Dr. Manjeet Kaur | Distt. Hosp. Solan | CH Rajgarh, Distt. Sirmaur | |
| 28. | Dr. (Mrs) Shelja Chandel | Distt. Hosp. Kullu | Distt. Hosp. Kullu | |
| 29. | Dr. (Mrs) Aruna Mehta | PHC Bhawarna, Distt. Kangra. | PHC Bhawarna, Distt. Kangra | |
| 30. | Dr. A. K. Gupta | Distt. Hosp. Nahan | Distt. Hosp. Nahan | |
| 31. | Dr. C. D. Sharma | H&FW Trg. School Parimahal. | H&FW Trg. School Parimahal | |
| 32. | Dr. Vijay Kumar Sharma | PHC Markand, Distt. Bilaspur. | Distt. Hospital Bilaspur | |
| 33. | Dr. Jaswant Singh Chandel | Distt. Hosp. Dharamsala | RH Rampur, Distt. Shimla | |
| 34. | Dr. Mohinder Kumar Gupta | PHC Thural | PHC Thural | |
| 35. | Dr. (Mrs) Swarsh Mahajan | CD Damtal | PHC Indora, District Kangra | |
| 36. | Dr. (Mrs) Usha Sood | Distt. Hosp. Solan | PHC Syri, Distt. Shimla | |
| 37. | Dr. (Mrs) Sudesh Lakhnpal | CD Kasumpti | CD Kasumpti | |
| 38. | Dr. S.D. Bharwal | Distt. Hosp. Una | Distt. Hosp. Hamipur | |

The above officers will report at the place of their postings within 15 days from the issue of this notification failing which they shall be deemed to have foregone promotion.

3. All the above officers will be on probation for a period of two years.

O.P. YADAVA,
Secretary.

Shimla-2, the 28th Dec. mber, 1987

No. Health-B(3)-84/87.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to appoint Dr. Vipul Sharma as H. P. H. S. Grade-II in the pay scale of Rs. 940-1000-40-1200/50-1400/60-1700-75-1850 for a period of six months on *ad hoc* basis from 8-7-87 (F. N.) or till the post is filled up on regular basis whichever is earlier.

Shimla-2, the 2nd January, 1988

No. Health-E(3)-9/87.—Dr. C. P. Aggarwal was promoted to the post of H. P. H. S. Grade-I, vide this Department Notification No. Health-E (3)-6/86, dated 27-4-1987 and was required to join at C. H. C. Nadaun, district Hamirpur within 10 days of the issue of notification i.e. upto 6-5-1987 failing which he would be deemed to have fore gone his promotion.

2. Since Dr. C. P. Aggarwal has not joined and has also fore gone his promotion as H. P. H. S. Grade-I, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order the cancellation of his promotion.

AJAY PRASAD,
Secretary.

Shimla-171002, the 16th January, 1988

No. Health-B(15)-11/87.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to transfer Shri Khem Raj, District Ayurvedic Officer, L&S at Keylong to Institute of Research in ISM, Jogindernagar, district Mandi against the post of Ayurvedic Physician with immediate effect.

Shri Khem Raj, D. A. O. shall leave his station only when his substitute joins at Keylong.

Shimla-171002 the 16th January, 1988

No. Health-(B)-(15) 11/87.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to promote Shri Badri Prashad, Ayurvedic Chikitsa Adhikari, as Chikitsak in the pay scale of Rs. 940-30-1000-40-1200/50-1400-60-1700-75-1850 Class-I (Gazetted) on purely on *ad hoc* basis for a period of six months or till the posts are filled up on regular basis whichever is earlier with immediate effect.

This purely *ad hoc* promotion will not confer any right of re-promotion, continuation seniority, confirmation etc.

The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is further pleased to post Shri Badri Prashad as Chikitsak in the Circle Hospital, Jogindernagar, District Mandi.

Shimla-171002, the 16th January, 1988

No. Health-B(15)-11/87.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to promote the following Ayurvedic Chikitsa Adhikaris as Medical Superintendents in the pay scale of Rs. 940-30-1000-40-1200/50-1400-60-1700-75-1850, Class-I (Gazetted) on purely on *ad hoc* basis for a period of six months or till the posts are filled up on regular basis whichever is earlier with immediate effect.

Shri Amar Nath, Ayurvedic Chikitsa Adhikari.
Shri Kedar Nath, Ayurvedic Chikitsa Adhikari.

These purely *ad hoc* promotions will not confer any right of re-promotion, continuation, seniority, confirmation etc.

The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is further pleased to post Shri Amar Nath as Medical Superintendent in the Regional Ayurvedic Hospital, Paprola, district Kangra and Shri Kedar Nath as Medical Superintendent, in the Regional Ayurvedic Hospital, Shimla.

AJAY PRASAD,
Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

मिचार्ड एवं जन स्वास्थ्य विभाग

अधिसूचनाएं

शिमला-2, 30 दिसम्बर, 1992 •

संख्या पी0 डब्ल्यू (सी) 10-17/72-III.—इस विभाग के अससंख्यक अधिसूचना, दिनांक 2-5-1992 द्वारा जिला ऊना में बाड़ नियन्त्रण कार्य हेतु स्वां नदी की चनेलाइजेशन बारे गठित समिति का कार्यकाल 31-1-93 तक बढ़ाने के लिए भारत के राष्ट्रपति अपनी सह्य स्वीकृति प्रदान करते हैं ।

भारत के राष्ट्रपति यह भी आदेश देते हैं कि समिति अपनी रिपोर्ट इसी कार्य अवधि में ही अपनी रिपोर्ट सरकार को प्रस्तुत करेगी ।

शिमला-2, 4 जनवरी, 1993

शिमला-2, 28 दिसम्बर, 1992

संख्या दिवाई 11-59/92-ऊना.—यः भारत के राष्ट्रपति को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यय पर मार्बेनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः गाँव टब्बा, तहसील व जिला ऊना में नलकूप नम्बर 54 के निर्माण हेतु भूमि अर्जित करनी अपेक्षित है। अतएव एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिक्षेत्र में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणी में निदिष्ट किया गया है उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का अर्जन अपेक्षित है।

2. यह अधिसूचना ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों को जो इससे सम्बन्धित हैं या हो सकते हैं, को जानकारी के लिए भू-अर्जन अधिनियम 1894 की धारा 4 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाता है।

3. पूर्वोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत के राष्ट्रपति इस समय इस उक्त में कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों, उनके कर्मचारियों और आमकों को इलाके की किसी भी भूमि में प्रवेश करने तथा सर्वेक्षण करने और उम धारा द्वारा अपेक्षित अथवा अनुमत सभी अन्य कार्यों को करने के लिए सहस्र प्राधिकार देते हैं।

4. कोई भी हितवद्ध व्यक्ति जिस उक्त परिक्षेत्र में कथित भूमि के अर्जन पर कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशित होने के तीस दिनों की अवधि के भीतर लिखित रूप में भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता, हमीरपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक निर्माण विभाग के सम्मुख अपनी आपत्ति दायर कर सकता है।

संख्या उद्योग 11(उ) 12-8/88.—भारत के राष्ट्रपति, श्री राम दाम ठाकुर का हिमाचल प्रदेश सामान्य उद्योग निगम सीमित के उपाध्यक्ष पद से तत्काल त्यागपत्र स्वीकृत करने के सहर्ष आदेश देते हैं।

शिमला-2, 1 जनवरी, 1993

संख्या 2-35/69-एम0आई0एम0एम0आई0एड ई0 मी0.—हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य लघु उद्योग एवं नियति निगम लिमिटेड के निदेशक मण्डल के गठन के सम्बन्ध में इस विभाग की समस्त अधिसूचनाओं का अधीक्षण करते हुए, भारत के राष्ट्रपति, हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य लघु उद्योग एवं नियति निगम लिमिटेड के निदेशक मण्डल का पुनर्गठन निम्न प्रकार में करने हेतु तत्काल सहर्ष आदेश देते हैं:—

1. श्री पी0 पी0 श्रीवास्तव, सलाहकार (पी) राज्यपाल, (हि0 प्र0) ... अध्यक्ष
2. श्री बी0 बी0 टण्डन, वित्तयुक्त एवं सचिव (उद्योग-वित्त), हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार ... निदेशक
3. श्री सुभाष नेगी, निदेशक, उद्योग, (हि0 प्र0) ... निदेशक
4. श्री अनिल कुमार खान्ना, मयुक्त सचिव (वित्त), हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार ... निदेशक
5. कृ० विनया भगत, प्रबन्ध निदेशक, हि० प्र० राज्य लघु उद्योग एवं नियति निगम ... निदेशक

शिमला-2, 7 जनवरी, 1993

संख्या उद्योग 11(छ)-11-31/92.—राज्य वित्तीय निगम अधिनियम 1951 (1951 का 63वां) की धारा 7(1) के अन्तर्गत हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश वित्तीय निगम के निदेशक मण्डल की अभिशङ्गा और भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के परामर्श से वित्त निगम द्वारा भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक से प्रदान किए गए उनके पत्र संख्या आई0ई0सी0डी0ओ0एच0प्र०/113/37 (111)92/93, दिनांक 3-12-1992 के अनुसार 120 लाख रुपये (एक सौ बीस लाख रुपये) के तदर्थ बन्ध पत्र के रूप में लिए जा रहे ऋण पर 12% वार्षिक दर से व्याज निर्धारित करने की सहर्ष अनुमति प्रदान करते हैं।

यह निर्गम वित्त विभाग की दैनिकी संख्या 5390-संस्वागत वित्त व लोक उद्यम दिनांक 30-12-92 की पूर्व सहमति से किया गया है।

शिमला-2, 7 जनवरी, 1993

संदर्भ : उद्योग-11 (छ)-11-31/92.—राज्य वित्तीय निगम अधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 63वां) की धारा 7 (1) के अन्तर्गत हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश वित्तीय निगम द्वारा 135 लाख (एक सौ पैंतीस लाख रुपये) के तदर्थ बन्ध पत्र के उपलक्ष में हिमाचल प्रदेश वित्तीय निगम 120 लाख (एक सौ बीस लाख रुपये) का ऋण प्राप्त करेगा, उसकी मूलधन की अदायगी अतः 12 प्रतिशत वार्षिक दर के हिसाब से व्याज देने की सहर्ष प्रत्याभूति (गारण्टी) प्रदान करते हैं जिसकी स्वीकृति भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक ने अपने पत्र संख्या-आई0ई0 सी0 डी0 सी0 एच0 प्र०/113/37 (111)-92/93 दिनांक 3-12-1992 द्वारा प्रदान की है।

इस प्रत्याभूति की अवधि ऋण लेने की तिथि से दो साल तक वैध होगी।

यह निर्गम वित्त विभाग की दैनिकी संख्या 5390-संस्वागत वित्त व लोक उद्यम दिनांक 30-12-92 की पूर्व सहमति से किया गया है।

आदेशानुसार,

बी० बी० टण्डन,
वित्तयुक्त एवं सचिव।

विस्तृत टिप्पणी

| जिला : ऊना | तहसील : ऊना |
|------------|------------------------|
| गाँव | क्षेत्र हैक्टेयरों में |
| 1 | 2 3 4 5 |
| टब्बा | 331 0 02 42 |

आदेश द्वारा,

एस० के० सूद,
आयुक्त एवं सचिव।

उद्योग विभाग

अधिसूचनाएं

शिमला-2, 28 दिसम्बर, 1992

संख्या उद्योग 11(छ) 12-8/88.—हिमाचल प्रदेश सामान्य उद्योग निगम सीमित के निदेशक मण्डल के गठन से सम्बन्धित इस विभाग की समस्त अधिसूचनाओं का अधीक्षण करते हुए, भारत के राष्ट्रपति हिमाचल प्रदेश सामान्य उद्योग निगम के निदेशक मण्डल का पुनर्गठन निम्न प्रकार से करने हेतु तत्काल सहर्ष आदेश देते हैं:—

1. श्री पी० पी० श्रीवास्तव, सलाहकार (पी) राज्यपाल। ... अध्यक्ष
2. श्री बी० बी० टण्डन, वित्तयुक्त एवं सचिव (उद्योग)। ... निदेशक
3. श्री एस० एस० सरमार, प्रबन्ध निदेशक, हिमाचल प्रदेश वित्तीय निगम। ... निदेशक
4. श्री योगेश खन्ना, प्रबन्ध निदेशक, हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य औद्योगिक विकास निगम। ... निदेशक
5. श्री अनिल कुमार खान्ना, संयुक्त सचिव (वित्त), हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार। ... निदेशक
6. श्री बी० एस० चौहान, प्रबन्ध निदेशक, हिमाचल प्रदेश सामान्य उद्योग निगम। ... निदेशक

श्रम विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला-171002, 31 अगस्त, 1992

संख्या 9-8/90-श्रम-भाग-4.—राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 17(1) में निहित शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए पीठासीन अधिकारी श्रम न्यायालय/औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हिमाचल प्रदेश द्वारा निम्नलिखित मामलों में दिए गए अवार्डज को हिमाचल प्रदेश राजपत्र में प्रकाशित करने के महर्ष आदेश देते हैं :—

| क्रम सं० | केस नं० | सम्बन्धित पक्षों का नाम | धारा | टिप्पणी |
|----------|------------|---|---------|--------------|
| 1. | रैफ-71/91 | मन्जू महान व अन्य बनाम उपाध्यक्ष कैंटीन मनेजिंग कमेटी हैडक्वार्टर एरिया, शिमला | धारा-10 | प्रकाशन हेतु |
| 2. | रैफ-64/91 | कपिल देव बनाम मनेजिंग डायरेक्टर, हिमाचल प्रदेश समाल इंडस्ट्रीज एण्ड एक्सपोर्ट कारपोरेशन, लि०, शिमला। | धारा-9 | " |
| 3. | रैफ-64/90 | मर्वश्री मस्त राम व अन्य बनाम मै० एटियाला टी स्टेट, गोपालपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश। | धारा-10 | " |
| 4. | रैफ-158/90 | हिमाचल तारपीन प्रोजेक्ट कर्मचारी यूनियन, काला अम्ब, बनाम मै० हिमाचल प्रदेश तारपीन प्रोजेक्ट प्राईवेट लिमिटेड, काला अम्ब, जिला सिरमौर। | धारा-10 | " |
| 5. | रैफ-71/90 | नरेन्द्र सिंह बनाम मै० एच० आर० टी० सी०, नाहन, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश। | धारा-10 | " |
| 6. | रैफ-14/91 | हरि राम बनाम अधिशाषी अभियन्ता, जल प्राप्ति विभाग, नगर निगम शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश। | धारा-10 | " |
| 7. | रैफ-45/91 | जयन्ता राम बनाम मै० खन्ना वाचिज, परवाणु, जिला सोलन, हिमाचल प्रदेश। | धारा-10 | " |
| 8. | रैफ-30/89 | मर्वश्री चमन लाल व अन्य बनाम मै० बैरा स्कूल प्रोजेक्ट, सुरगाणी, जिला चम्बा। | धारा-10 | " |
| 9. | रैफ-143/90 | टेक चन्द बनाम मैसज बैरा स्कूल प्रोजेक्ट, एन० एच० पी० सी० सुरगाणी, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश। | धारा-10 | " |
| 10. | रैफ-156/88 | सुभाष चन्द्र बनाम मैनेजमेंट मैनेज बैरा स्कूल प्रोजेक्ट, सुरगाणी, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश। | धारा-10 | " |
| 11. | रैफ-153/90 | संग्राम सिंह बनाम मैनेज बैरा स्कूल प्रोजेक्ट, सुरगाणी, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश। | धारा-10 | " |
| 12. | रैफ-74/90 | सर्वश्री मानसिंह व अन्य बनाम सहायक अभियन्ता, एच० पी०, पी० डब्ल्यू० डी०, सब डिविजन सलूणी, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश। | धारा-10 | " |
| 13. | रैफ-72/89 | प्रमोदीश कुमार बनाम मैनेजमेंट आफ एच० आर० टी० सी० नाहन, हिमाचल प्रदेश। | धारा-10 | " |

आदेशानुसार,
प० होरा,
आयुक्त एवं सचिव।

Before Shri R. K. Mahajan, Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla

Shri A. K. Sharma, Authorised Representative of the respondents.

Ref-71/91

AWARD

Manju Mahajan

.. Petitioner

Versus

Deputy Chairman, Canteen Managing Committee, Headquarters, P. H. & H. P. Areas, Golden Lion, Shimla-3.

.. Respondents.

Shri J. C. Bhardwaj, Authorised Representative of the petitioner.

1. The Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla has referred the following dispute to this court for adjudication under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Hereinafter shortly referred to as the 'Act') on failure of the conciliation proceedings between the parties vide its notification, dated 21-8-91. The other two references on the same subject titled S/Shri Kewal Singh and Binita Joshi would also be disposed off with this reference as the common question of law and facts is involved in these cases also.

"Whether the termination of services of Manju Mahajan w.e.f. 21-4-90 by the Deputy Chairman, Canteen Managing Committee, Hqrs., P. H. and Himachal Pradesh Areas, Golden Lion, Shimla is legal and justified? If illegal, to what amount of compensation and service benefits Manju Mahajan is entitled?"

2. Manju Mahajan, Binita Joshi and Kewal Singh were employed as Sales girls/Salesman respectively by the respondents in the year, i.e. 15-3-1983 on a consolidated pay of Rs. 275/-P. M. Binita Joshi was appointed on 25-11-1985 and Shri Kewal Singh was appointed on 15-3-1983. They were not getting more than 1100/-at the time of termination of their services on 21-4-1990. They state that previously they were serving in a canteen run by the Western Command, Shimla and when Western Command was shifted to Chandimandir they become the employees of the respondents, w. e. f. 1-2-1985.

3. Mr. T. D. Kashyap was the manager of the respondent canteen. Shri B. N. Sharma was the Accountant of the canteen. There was a domestic enquiry held against these two officers regarding the charges of embezzlement and misappropriation and they (petitioners) were removed from their service. It is also alleged that they had enjoyed career without any blemish and their services were terminated without any chargesheet. No enquiry was held in accordance with the principles of natural justice. They were not paid the retrenchment compensation as required under section 25 F of the Act. They pray for their re-instatement with all consequential benefits. Show cause notice was given to Manju Mahajan in a court of enquiry regarding the following allegations. [You helped Major T. D. Kashyap (Retired), the then manager and Naib-Subedar B. N. Sharma (Retd.), the Accountant of the canteen in manipulation of the canteen accounts, ledger by fraudulent and dishonest means]. (b) [You along with other salesman/Sales girls] handed over the stores worth Rs. 10,618/10 paise on loan or credit to various individuals without payment. You also failed to voluntarily report the serious lapses immediately after 16-5-1989 (on attachment of Major T. D. Kashyap (Retd.)), with this Headquarters immediately after June 3, 1989 (When Nb/Sub. B. N. Sharma (Retd.) was relieved from the offg. charge]. (c) You did not make any record of stores issued for sales in the Retail Stores (Sale counter) from the Bulk Stores. Similar charges were repeated against other petitioners. The theme of the allegations is that they connived with each other and by way of giving the articles/material on credit and by not keeping the proper accounts, the petitioners have shown lack of devotion to their duty and it reflects of their moral turpitude. It is also alleged that loss has been caused in the stores by way of adopting this method as recovery of amount has not been effected. The petitioners were served with show cause notices as to why their services should not be terminated. The enquiry was held according to army rules along with other officials and the petitioners were found to be guilty of the aforesaid charges and awarded punishment of termination of their services by the respondent management. There was nine individuals against whom the enquiry was conducted and they were found guilty. The plea of the respondents as revealed from the written statement filed by them is that this court has no jurisdiction to try this reference as canteen is not an industry for the purpose of the Act. The petitioners were given full opportunity to defend themselves in the enquiry conducted against them by the army authorities. Only indirect control is exercised by the General Officer Commanding of Panjab, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh. The Himachal Pradesh employees are paid according to the terms of contract. The funds to run the canteen are met by the Regimental Private Fund. In such eventuality, providing of permanent jobs to the petitioners is out of the question. The petitioners have been rightly terminated after the findings of the enquiry. There is a complaint pending against the petitioners along with others i.e. Manager of the canteen with the police in respect of embezzlement of goods. It is also alleged that the petitioners helped the Manager, T. D. Kashyap and others in manipulation of the canteen accounts, ledgers etc., and they also did not make any

record of sales, from bulk stores. From the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were frame by me on 24-10-91.

1. Whether the termination of the services of the petitioners is unjustified and illegal?(OPP Parties)
2. Whether the enquiry has not been conducted in consonance with the principles of natural justice? (OPP)
3. Whether the present dispute is not maintainable under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, as alleged? (OPR).
4. Relief.

FINDINGS ON ISSUES

Issue No. 1 and 2 :

4. Both these issues i.e. No. 1 & 2 are inter-connected and would be disposed off together in order to avoid the duplicity in discussion.

5. The petitioners adducted evidence by appearing as their own witness on oath. The respondent also produced R. W. 1 Shri B. S. Thakur, Officiating manager of the respondent canteen, who happened to take over the charge from Shri T. D. Kashyap on 3-6-1989 and has also relied upon the enquiry report and findings thereon. The Enquiry Report has been proved by Major B. K. Ghai, R.W. 3 who was a member of the Board. Enquiry report is Ex. R. W. 2/B. Mr. Bhardwaj, representative of the petitioners has submitted that enquiry report does not directly disclose any offence or irregularity against the petitioners. He further states that they were only summoned as witnesses against Major T. D. Kashyap and V. N. Sharma major culprits and who were their superior officers at the relevant time. He further submits that the canteen is the industry for the purpose of the Act and the reference is maintainable. He also submits that mere changing of the headquarters of the Western Command from Shimla to Chandimandir does not involved change of the employer or working conditions of the petitioners. Mr. Capt. A. K. Sharma, representative of the petitioner submits that the charges have been proved against the petitioners after holding the enquiry. I am of the view that ordinarily enquiry report is not to be set aside but if after the perusal of the enquiry report and the evidence which has been led in the court, if it is found by this Court/Tribunal that the findings are perverse and unreasonable and cannot be sustained on evidence, the termination can be set aside. First of all, I would refer the nature of the working of the petitioners at the counter from the statement of Mr. Thakur and the petitioners. Mr. Thakur states that goods are received to the canteen from Ambala Depot through representative of the respondents on invoice. These are checked physically by a Board of officers. After checking thoroughly and tallying with the invoice, these are stored in the godown. Their entry is recorded in the ledgers. The goods/item of the goods are issued to the canteen. These are sold on cash memos. The Salesman/Sales girls have their respective seats in the canteen and the customer approaches the salesman/girls. He hands over the list of his requirements. Salesman/girl issues two bills. One bill is handed over to the customer & duplicate copy is placed with the items to be supplied. The amount of the bill is deposited with the cashier by the customer. Cashier affixes his "paid" stamp and the bill is handed over to the customer. The customer then presents this bill to the delivery counter and there is a checking at the delivery counter to ensure that the payment has been made by the customer to the cashier. After that delivery of the items takes place. The original is retained by the Salesman/girls and the duplicate is retained by the customer. Summary of the sold items is prepared at the closing of the day and usual tallying of the cash with the goods sold takes place by the cashier against the bills. According to Mr. Thakur, there were one Asstt. Manager, One Accountant, One Assistant Accountant, Five Sales girls, three helpers and one storekeeper. There was a

deficiency in the grossery and liquor worth Rs. 2,27,000/- as on 30-6-1989. The main deficiency was regarding the liquor etc. It is also in his statement that Major T. D. Kashyap did not hand over the wrist watches. According to him, the sales girls and the storekeeper Incharge of the store of the canteen, I have also perused the findings of the enquiry officer and there was a loss of Rs. 2,27,000/- on account of grossery and liquor from 1978 to May, 1989 when Major T. D. Kashyap was the Incharge. In Enquiry report para No. 7, there is a mention that items have been given on loan or credit to the tune of Rs. 22,159.05 paise to Lt. Col. Dhaliwal, Lt. Col. R. K. Chopra, and Major K. C. Singh. No record is available. The officers have obtained a clearance certificate or even denied of having received the articles/material. In fact in para No. 30 of the findings, Mr. Kashyap has been incriminated of having failed to exercise the control over the affairs of the canteen. Cap. Singh and O. P. Grover, Lt. Col. Dhaliwal and P. V. Singh have also been dubbed for having failed to observe the supervisory or other form of procedural formalities which could go a long way in running the affairs of the canteen properly. In fact, the canteen affairs have been carried out very casually and listlessly. Had there been a 60 to 75% of care of the canteen affairs by the superior officers the things would have been different. The guidelines by the internal administration were not at all adhered to. Periodical checks up were not done. The poor salesgirls/salesman at least cannot indulge in such a huge racket unless there is a complete lack of supervision. They have been charged only for supplying material/articles to the superior officers to the tune of Rs. 10,000/-. There is no explanation coming as to what happened to other items/goods worth lakhs. They all appeared as witnesses and their defence is that they did not embezzle amount. They came to know when the services of T. D. Kashyap were terminated. It is also strange that even the accounts were not checked. The petitioners are salesgirls/salesman and they cannot refuse the orders of their superiors. If superiors order for supply they are bound to obey the orders. In fact, T. D. Kashyap was the main culprit and when he was asked questions by the Enquiry Officers regarding issuing of the chits he had no comments to offer. I find from the findings of enquiry that they had no active role to play at all and the main culprits were superior officers who exercised lack of control and the petty sales girls/salesman cannot be made the scapegoats. Question arises as to why the officers were sleeping for over two years when the sales girls/salesman were committing any irregularity. In fact, they did not abet the offence and main culprits are superior officers including T. D. Kashyap, Storekeeper, Cashier etc. and not the petitioners. It means that there was no regular checking of the accounts also. It was a free for all. I, therefore, for the reasons recorded hold that there is no evidence against the petitioners regarding the allegations of embezzlement etc. and decide both these issues accordingly in favour of the petitioners and against the respondents. I also hold that the enquiry was also not fair proper.

Issue No. 3 :

6. In my view, the canteen is an industry for the purpose of the Act as required under Section 2 (j) of the Act as it is an organisation involving systematic activities for the distribution of the goods with a view to satisfy the human wants. It is being done with the co-operation of employers and the employees. Regarding the change of service conditions with the shifting of the Western Command from Shimla to Chandigarh, it is neither a subject matter of reference nor is relevant for deciding this issue. The workers have completed more than 240 days and their services could not be terminated without compliance of section 25 F of the Act whether by contract or otherwise. Even the contractual service cannot be terminated arbitrarily. I, therefore, for the reasons recorded decide this issue accordingly in favour of the petitioners and against the respondents.

RELIEF

7. In view of my findings on issues and the reasons recorded, I pass an award after setting aside the

termination orders, accordingly in favour of the petitioners and against the respondent management. I order the re-instatement of the petitioners by the respondent with the continuity of the service without back wages but with a compensation of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) only to each petitioner in lieu of back wages. Reference is answered accordingly. Let a copy of this award be sent to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-2, for its due publication in the official gazette i. e. Himachal Pradesh Rajptra in accordance with law. A copy be given to the parties free of costs, if applied for by them. The parties are, however, left to bear their own costs of these proceedings. The file after its due completion be consigned to the record room after its due completion.

Announced on this 27th day of June, 1992, at Shimla.

Seal. R. K. MAHAJAN,
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,
H. P. Shimla, 27-6-1992.

Before Shri R. K. Mahajan, Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla

Ref-64/91-

Kapil Dev. Petitioner

Versus

Managing Director, Himachal Pradesh, State Small Industries and Export Corporation, Ltd., Shimla
. Respondents.

Shri J. C. Bhargwaj, Authorised Representative of the petitioner.

Shri Rattan Lal Kaith, Authorised Representative of the respondents.

AWARD

1. The Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla vide its notification, dated the 8th August, 1991, referred the following dispute to this court for adjudication under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter shortly referred to as the 'Act') on failure of the conciliation proceedings between the parties:—

“Whether the action of the Managing Director, Himachal Pradesh, State Small Industries and Export Corporation, Ltd., Shimla in transferring Shri Kapil Dev Storekeeper on 2-2-1984 and his placement as a clerk at the Headquarters is legal and justified? If illegal, to what amount of relief and compensation, Shri Kapil Dev, workman is entitled?”

“Whether the demand of Shri Kapil Dev for the pay scale of Rs. 570-1080 from the Managing Director Himachal Pradesh State Small Industries Export Corporation, Ltd., Shimla w. e. f. 4-8-1980 (date of appointment) to 1-2-1984 as storekeeper is legal and justified? If legal, from what date the petitioner is entitled to the said pay scale?”

2. The petitioner, Shri Kapil Dev claims that he was appointed as Storekeeper in the year, 1980 i. e. on 4-8-1980 by the respondent management and the pay scale of Rs. 400—650 was given to him. It appears from the annexures placed on record with the claim petition that the requisitions were placed by the respondent management for two posts of clerk and storekeeper separately (One in each cadre). The petitioner was interviewed for the post of the storekeeper after his name was sponsored by the District Employment Exchange, Solan for the post of a Storekeeper and the appointment letter of storekeeper was also issued to the petitioner by the respondent management in the pay scale of Rs. 400—650 (Pre-revised) through he was called for interview for the post of storekeeper in the pay scale of Rs. 160—400 (Pre-revised) and later on Rs. 570-1080 and now Rs. 1800-3200 at present. His grievance is that later on, at the time of issuing the appointment letter on 29-7-1980, his scale was arbitrarily

changed by the respondent management in his appointment letter though he had been interviewed for the scale of Rs. 160-400 and later on he came to know about this anomaly in the year, 1984 when he was shown in the seniority list of clerks and he started representing through union as well as personally to the respondent management for the redressal of his grievance and ultimately he did not get any relief. He has prayed that he may be given the pay scale of Rs. 570-1080 (Pre-revised 160-400) as he was appointed as a Storekeeper and performed the duties as such as is evident from his appointment letter placed on record as well as the advertisement of the vacancies by the respondent management in which the lesser scale has been shown. The pay scale at present is Rs. 1800-3200.

3. The case of the respondent management is that in fact the petitioner was given a scale on the pattern of 'HIMTRON' and he was offered appointment in cases the pay scale of Rs. 400-650 was acceptable to him. It is further alleged that this court has no jurisdiction to try this reference. The main plank of the case of respondent is that since the petitioner has accepted the condition No. 5 of the appointment letter regarding the pay scale so he is estopped from demanding the pay scale of Rs. 570-1080. It is further pleaded that the matter has been raked up after ten years. From the pleadings of the parties, the following issues are framed.—

1. "Whether the transfer of Shri Kapil Dev, petitioner from the post of storekeeper to the post of clerk w. e. f. 2-2-1984 is illegal and unjustified? (O. P. Parties)
2. Whether the petitioner is entitled for the pay of Storekeeper w. e. f. 4-8-1980 to 1-2-1984? (OPP).
3. Whether the petition is not maintainable as alleged? (OPR)
4. Relief.

FINDINGS ON ISSUES

Issue No. 1 & 2 :

4. Both these issues are inter-connected and would be disposed off together in order to avoid the duplicity in discussion. Mr. Bhardwaj, representative of the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has not been given the pay scale for which he had been interviewed and his scale was later on arbitrarily changed by the respondent management. The petitioner has since been representing to the management for grant of the scale as mentioned by him in his claim petition. It has been further submitted that the storekeepers in Government organisations as well as in the Corporate Sector are getting this scale which has been denied to the petitioner. Mr. Kaith, representative of the respondent has submitted that advertisement of a post and issuance of letter to appear in the interview does not bind the respondent management to give him a scale of the post for which he has been interviewed. He has further submitted that he was given less scale though he was given appointment letter for the post of storekeeper in the scale of Rs. 400-650. Mr. Kaith has further submitted that according to rules of the Corporation, he was given the pay scale mentioned in the appointment letter. I have given a deep thought over the rival contentions of the parties and I am unable to be persuaded by the arguments of Mr. Kaith after perusing the record of the case on the following grounds. Firstly, advertisement was issued for the post of storekeeper in the pay of Rs. 160-400 (Pre-revised) and interview call was given to the petitioner for the said post. It is admitted that appointment letter shows that he was given the post of a storekeeper in the pay scale of Rs. 400-650 which was non-existent. Secondly, the petitioner was performing the duties of storekeeper for which he was appointed and this contention of the petitioner has also not been contested by the respondent. The case of the respondent Corporation would have been on sounder footing had he not been appointed as Storekeeper as per the appointment letter. It looks unreasonable to resile from the promise given in the advertisement as well as interview letter and

then in the appointment letter regarding the nature of the job. The State is bound by promiscry estopples which is based on principles of justice, equity and good conscience. The petitioner came to know later on regarding this anomaly and the management did not concede as is apparent from the representations and statement of the petitioner on oath while appearing to depose in this court as his own witness as P. W. 1. Thirdly, it is admitted by the respondents that the petitioner has been working as a storekeeper as is apparent from the statement of R. W. 1 Sushil Kumar, Assistant Accounts Officer of the respondents who happened to appear to depose before this court on behalf of the respondents. R. W. 2 Devinder Singh, Assistant has further stated that there were no Recruitment and Promotion Rules in 'HIMTRON' in the year, 1983. It has been submitted that the guidelines on the pattern of 'PUNJSTAR' were followed in the matter of the pay scales by the Corporation in this case. I am afraid to agree with this contention of the respondents management as even if there are any guidelines as such, they go against the advertisement, interview letter and appointment letter issued to the petitioner. No policy decision of the respondent Corporation has been placed on record to show that the pattern of 'PUNJSTAR' was ever followed by the respondent management. I am also of the view that the petitioner cannot be discriminated regarding the grant of pay scale as similarly situated persons in other Government Department and Corporations are being given the same pay scale. There is no difference in duties. Supreme Court Ruling has been relied upon by the petitioner—1991-Labour and Industrial Cases-1120; Employees of Tannery and Footwear Corporation of India Ltd. and another—petitioners versus Union of India and others—respondents. Constitution of India Art. 39(d)—Equal pay for equal work—Employees in unionised cadre in 'A' Corporation of Government—Having same pay scale in 1970 as that of employees working in the same posts in 'B' Corporation. Level of posts in question in both the Corporations also the same. No subsequent change in duties and functions of employees in both Corporations—Revision of Pay Scale of employees of 'B' Corporation only—Government authorities directed to revise the pay scales of employees of 'A' Corporation at par with the pay scale enjoyed by employees of 'B' Corporation. I am of the view that the transfer of the petitioner from the post of storekeeper to the post of a clerk by the respondent management to a lower scale is not justified and legal. The pay scale of the petitioner could also not be changed arbitrarily by the respondent management to the prejudice of the petitioner and the same is quashed and set aside. The petitioner could also not be shown in the seniority list of clerks. He will be deemed to have been appointed as a Storekeeper in the pay Scale of Rs. 160-400 (Pre-revised) and subsequently the scale of Rs. 570-1080 and Rs. 1800-3200 as revised from time to time w. e. f. 4-8-1980 (date of joining of the petitioner). I, therefore, for the reasons recorded decide both these issues accordingly in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent management.

Issue No. 3 :

5. In my view, the petition is maintainable as it relates to the grant of pay scale as a result of anomaly. The matter has not been pressed vehemently by the parties during the course of arguments also. I, therefore, for the reasons recorded decide this issue accordingly in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent management as the matter was taken up by the union from time to time as is apparent from the letter, dated 10-7-1990 placed on record.

RELIEF

6. In view of my findings on issues and the reasons recorded, I pass an award accordingly in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent management allowing the petitioner the pay scale of Rs. 160-400 (Pre-revised) w. e. f. 4-8-1980 (Date of appointment of the petitioner) with all the subsequent revisions from time to time. The arrears be paid to the petitioner within one month from date of publication of this award in the official gazette i.e. Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra. Reference is answered affirmatively. Award is passed. Let a copy of this award be sent to

the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-2, for its due publication in the Official Gazette i.e. Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra in accordance with the law. A copy be also given to the parties free of costs if applied for by them. The parties are however, left to bear their own costs of these proceedings. The file be consigned to the record room after its due completion.

Announced on this 25th day of July, 1992, at Shimla.

Seal. R. K. MAHAJAN,
Presiding Officer Labour Court,
H. P. Shimla. 25-7-1992.

Before Shri R. K. Mahajan, Presiding Officer, Labour Court, H. P. Shimla

Ref-64/90.

S. Shri Mast Ram and others .. Petitioners.

Versus

M/s Patiala Tea Estate, Gopalpur,
District Kangra Himachal Pradesh. .. Respondents

Shri Ajay Dogra, for the petitioner.

Shri Kirender Singh, for the respondents.

AWARD

The parties have arrived at a settlement amicably and filed a settlement in this Court to-day. The respondent management has agreed to regularise the services of all those workers, who have put in more than 240 days of continuous service with the management ignoring the fictional breaks. The management has also agreed to pay token compensation to those workers who were retrenched to the tune of Rs. 2,000/- (2 Thousand) only to each such worker within six months. The workers will also be entitled to the benefit of the continuity of service. Regarding arrears of wages, they have filed separate settlement as mentioned above which is not a subject matter of reference. The settlement is Ex-RX. Mr. Dogra has also agreed to the proposal. I pass an award accordingly in terms of the aforesaid settlement as it will ensure the industrial peace and output of the factory. The workers have also assured to work whole heartedly and the management in turn has also assured to provide the amenities to the workers. Thus the long outstanding dispute has been settled which both the parties will adhere strictly. Reference is answered accordingly. Let a copy of this award be sent to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-2, for its due publication in the official gazette i.e. Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra in accordance with the law and a copy be given to the parties free of costs, if applied for by them. The parties are, however, left to bear their own costs of these proceedings. The file after due completion, be consigned to the record room.

Announced on this 6th day of July, 1992 in open court at Nurpur.

Seal. R. K. MAHAJAN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, H.P. Shimla
Camp Nurpur. 6-7-92.

Before Shri R.K. Mahajan, Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla

Ref-Case No. 158/90.

Himachal Terpene Products Karmchari Union, Kala Amb .. Petitioners.

Versus

M/s Himachal Terpene Products, Pvt. Ltd., Kala Amb, District Sirmour (HP) .. Respondents.

Shri A.K. Gupta, Authorised Representative of the petitioners.

Shri V.K. Gupta, Authorised Representative of the respondents.

AWARD

1. The Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla vide its notification, dated the 23rd March, 1990, has referred the following dispute to this court for adjudication under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Hereinafter, shortly referred to as the 'Act') on failure of the conciliation proceedings between the parties :-

"Whether the demands raised by the Himachal Terpene Products Workers' Union, Kala Amb vide demand charter, dated 15-1-1990 are justified and in order? If yes, what relief and amount of compensation, the workmen are entitled to?"

2. The petitioners' Union raised a demand notice, dated 25-1-1990 and the major demands now confined by them are now revision of scales and house rent allowance. The petitioners have prayed that agreement, dated 30-5-86 may be treated in force upto 31-10-89 and not later than that. They have demanded scales on the following pattern from April, 1989. Grade A Rs. 600-35-775-45-1000-50-1100, Grade B Rs. 700-40-900-50-1150-60-1270, Grade C. Rs. 800-50-1050-60-1350-70-1490. They have also demanded that these grades may be given after C—Rs. 100/- w.e.f. April, 1889. They have also demanded 20% annual allowance, washing allowance Rs. 10/- to Rs. 20/- per month and house rent allowance @ 20% per month as paid to other employees of the respondent factory. The categories of grades of workers have mentioned in Ex.R.I. It may be pointed out at the outset that the allowance had been settled with the intervention of this court. Regularisation of the workers was also made settled likewise. The petitioners were only demanding 20% like in their wages i.e. Rs. 100/- (consolidated amount) as a package deal to each worker but the management refused to do so.

3. The case of the respondent management as revealed from the written statement filed by them is that the petitioners could not have terminated the agreement, dated 30-5-1986 w.e.f. 31-10-1989. The termination of the agreement is not valid as two months' notice was not given by them and the old agreement dated 30-5-86 is still valid. It is also alleged that the company is paying the minimum wages with other reasonable allowances as defined under the definition of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948. The company has suffered losses as per balance sheets Rs. 5 for 1988, R.6 for 1990, R.7 for 1991 and is unable to pay the increased wages as demanded by the petitioners. The Government of Himachal Pradesh has also raised the prices of raw material and as such it cannot compete with other States. Recent liberalised industrial policy of the Government has also put the factory at a disadvantage with respect to earning of the profits. From the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed by me on 2-11-91 :-

1. Whether the demands of the workers are justified as mentioned in the demand charter (OPP)
2. Whether the reference is not maintainable under section 12 (5) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947? (DPR).
3. Relief.

FINDINGS ON ISSUES

Issue No. 1:

4. Mr. A.K. Gupta, representative of the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are ready to accept as proposed by this court Rs. 100/- as package deal to each workers by the respondent management. The respondent has not cared to accept this proposal. He has further submitted that in fact, the balance-sheets do not reflect the reality of the financial position of the

company and the workers cannot be made to starve. Mr. V. K. Gupta, representative of the respondents has submitted that the old agreement, dated 30-5-1986 still subsists as there is no legal notice by the workers to the management for its abrogation or its termination as required under the law and as such the reference is invalid on this score also, as two months' notice was not given by the petitioners for its termination/abrogation. The workers only produced Shri Daian Singh, General Secretary as P.W.I. and management produced Shri A.R. Soni, Manager of the respondent Factory as R.W.I. The version of the worker is supported by P.W.I. by appearing in this court and that of the management by R.W.I. I am of the view that the company is not at a loss to such extent that it cannot afford to pay Rs.100/- per month to each worker as a package deal. The company is in existence since 1974. The company according to R.W.I. started running into losses since 1989 as per balance sheets filed by the respondents in this court. If the factory was running into losses and was unable to compete with other states or in the market, it would have been better to close down the unit than to force the workers to starve. In fact, the factories start showing losses in balance sheets just to cover the unit under BFIR scheme after getting the units declared sick. Workers are never associated in the accounts as they are illiterate. The stand of the management that they cannot afford Rs. 100/- per month to each worker as a package deal is also unrealistic. The Supreme Court recently observed in LAW-IC-1992, *Workmen versus Management of Reprakos Brett & Co Ltd.* (Page 293) that while keeping in view the socio economic aspect of the wage structure, we are of the view that it is necessary to add the following additional components as a guide for fixing the minimum wage in the industry, Children education, Medical requirement, minimum recreation including festivals, ceremonies and provision for old age-marriages etc. should further constitute 25% of the total minimum wage. In fact, this recommendation was made in the Labour conference held in 1957 in New Delhi and the Supreme Court has given direction in the shape of guidelines to add this component to avoid starvation of the workers. It was observed further that if employer cannot pay the minimum wages, has not right to engage labour and no justification to run the factory. It is my judicial experience that there is a big gap between revision of minimum wages and the galloping inflation. The workers are not to suffer for the labour put by them towards production, if they are not paid the minimum wages keeping pace with the inflation. In the facts and circumstances of this case, the demands of the petitioners for Rs.100/- per month to each worker as a package deal is not highly unreasonable or arbitrary as compared to their demand for revision of pay scales. I, therefore for the reasons recorded hold that the demand of Rs.100/- per month to each worker as a package deal is fully justified and in order and decide this issue accordingly in favour of the petitioners and against the respondent management.

Issue No. 2:

I do not agree with the contention of the respondent management that the reference is not maintainable on the ground that two months' Notice was not given by the petitioners for its termination/abrogation as required in a pedantic manner and practically of the worker and technical approach is to be made in view of the illiteracy of the worker and technical approach of law cannot be expected from them and further they cannot be made victims of it. The agreement would be demand notice which is a reasonable interpretation. I accept the view point of the petitioners that two months' period of notice may be counted from demand notice i.e. w.e.f. 25-3-1990 after expiry of two months of submission of the demand charter by the petitioners. I, therefore, for the reasons recorded decide this issue accordingly in favour of the petitioners and against the respondent management. The other points are not subject matter of the reference and hence need not be answered.

Relief:

6. In view of my findings on issues and the reasons recorded, I pass an award accordingly in favour of the petitioners and against the respondent management. The petitioners are entitled to Rs.100/- each worker per month from the respondent management w.e.f. 25-3-1990 and the respondent management is directed to pay the same to the petitioners immediately within one month from the date of publication of this award in the Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra failing which an interest of 18% will have to be paid by them to the petitioners on this amount. Award is passed accordingly, in affirmative. Reference is answered. Let a copy of this award be sent to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla for its due publication in the official gazette i.e. Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra in accordance with the law. A copy be given to the parties free of costs, if applied for by them. The parties are however, left to bear their own costs of these proceedings. The file after its due completion, be consigned to the record room.

Announced on this 3rd day of July, 1992, at Shimla.

Seal.

R.K. MAHAJAN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Himachal
Pradesh, Shimla, 3-7-1992.

Before Shri R. K. Mahajan, Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla

Ref-71/90-

Narinder Singh

..Petitioner.

Versus

Management of HRTC, Nahan, District Sirmour,
Himachal Pradesh. ..Respondents.

Shri A. K. Gupta, for the petitioner.
None for the respondents.

AWARD

The petitioner claims himself to be the Cleaner-cum-conductor on daily wages with the respondent management right from 29-4-1972. In fact, he was appointed by the erstwhile Himachal Government Transport and discharged by the same organisation in March, 1974 for not finding his work satisfactory during the probation period. It is not denied that he has not completed 240 days in service of the respondents. The petitioner's plea is that it is a case of retrenchment and no enquiry was held under section 25 F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter shortly referred to as the 'Act'). He was also not paid the retrenchment compensation as required under the Act. The Government has sent the following reference on failure of the conciliation proceedings. At this stage, Shri K.C. Chauhan has appeared on behalf of the respondents.

"Whether the termination of services of Shri Narinder Singh by the erstwhile HGT is legal and maintainable? If illegal, to what amount of compensation and service benefits, Shri Narinder Singh is entitled for and the agency liable for payment of such benefits?"

The respondent has opposed the petition on the ground that the petitioner has come before the court after a lapse of 18 years and reference should have been made against the erstwhile Himachal Government Transport and not against the HRTC. Mr. Gupta has submitted that HRTC is not a necessary party whereas Mr. Chauhan states otherwise. I am of the view after hearing the parties and the material placed on record that the reference should have been made against the Himachal Government Transport and not against the HRTC. The petition is also not maintainable as the worker never represented against his termination by way of appeal and representations etc. as nothing has been

brought on record nor has he stated in this court. He has only stated orally in the court that he has been representing to the authorities. I do not place reliance on his statement as usually workers agitate their claim through their unions or otherwise. The petitioner has been rightly discharged during the employment period. Moreover the petition is also not maintainable in the facts and circumstances of this case as it is a digging of the old claim which would disturb the service condition of so many persons. The petition is also belated and cannot be allowed. I, therefore, for the reasons recorded decide this reference against the petitioner and in favour of the respondents. The petition is not at all entitled to any relief at this stage. Reference is answered in negative. Award is passed accordingly in favour of the respondents and against the petitioner. A copy of this award be sent to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-2 for its due publication in the official gazette i. e. Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra in accordance with law and a copy be given to the parties free of costs if applied for by them. The parties are, however, left to bear their own costs of these proceedings. The file after its due completion be consigned to the record room.

Announced on this 4th day of June, 1992 in open court at Shimla.

Seal
R.K. MAHAJAN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Himachal
Pradesh, Shimla, 4-6-1992.

Before Shri R.K. Mahajan, Presiding Officer, Labour
Court, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla

Ref-14/91-

Hari Ram, ..Petitioner.

Versus

Executive Engineer, Water Supply Department
Municipal Corporation, Shimla ..Respondents.

Shri Ramesh Thakur, AR of the petitioner.
Shri Balbir Singh, Executive Engineer, AR of the
respondents.

AWARD

1. The Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla vide its notification, dated the 4th March, 1991, referred the following dispute to this court for adjudication under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Hereinafter shortly referred to as the 'Act') on failure of the conciliation proceedings between the parties :—

“Whether the action of the Executive Engineer, Water Supply Department, Municipal Corporation, Shimla in redesignating Shri Hari Ram from the post of Keyman to the post of beldar is legal and justified? If illegal, to what relief, Shri Hari Ram is entitled?”

2. The petitioner claims that he was appointed by the respondent management as a labourer in the year 1984 and in the year 1986, he was redesignated as a keyman according to the petitioner. It is also alleged by him that the petitioner was forced to discharge the duties of beldar after 18-7-1990 and till that date he worked as a keyman. According to the petitioner, there was no enquiry held against him. No chargesheet was served on him. No compensation was paid and on these grounds, he has described his termination as illegal and unjustified. He further submits that he has been victimised on account of trade union activities. He prays for his re-instatement as keyman with continuity of service with all the consequential benefits.

3. The case of the respondent is that in fact, he was never appointed as a keyman nor a fitter grade-II.

In fact, there is no post of a keyman and only the post of fitter grade-II is the only line of promotion from the post of beldar. The respondent further alleges that the petitioner joined as beldar in August, 1985 and he is at serial number 47 of the seniority list of the daily wages beldars. It is also denied that the junior persons have been promoted and his case has not been considered. From the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed by me on 24-7-1991 :—

1. Whether the petitioner has been demoted unjustifiably from the post of keyman to the post of beldar? (OPF)
2. Relief.

FINDINGS ON ISSUES

Issue No.1:

4. The representative of the petitioner has submitted that Shri Hari Ram is working as keyman with the respondents and his reversion in the year, 1986 is illegal and arbitrary. He further submits that he has been victimised on account of trade union activities. He has also challenged the seniority list placed on record by the respondents in respect of the daily wages beldars.

5. The representative of the respondents has submitted that in fact there is no post of keyman and only the post of fitter grade-II exists in the department and the promotion is ordered according to the seniority list of daily wages beldars after 7/8 years depending upon the availability of the posts. He further submits that in fact the feeder category for promotion to the post of fitter grade-II is the beldar. The petitioner was at no stage or point of time appointed as keyman according to the respondent as alleged by the petitioner. I am unable to agree with the view point of the representative of the petitioner that he was appointed as a keyman. According to the statement of Shri Balbir Singh, Executive Engineer of the respondent corporation who appeared as R.W.1, Shimla Water supply scheme, which is under the control of the respondent corporation is divided in to 17 sectors. Each sector has a permanent fitter. Previously, permanent fitter was known as a keyman. He further explains that labourers are given to the fitters for rendering necessary assistance to them and some time in cases of the emergency, the management utilises the services of the petitioner as a helper with the keyman. The mere fact that in case of emergency, the petitioner has worked as a helper with the keyman/fitter grade-II, does not confer upon him the status of the fitter grade-II, previously known as keyman. What happens in reality is that these beldars are sometimes deployed to operate the water supply in different areas. According to R.W. 3, he has been promoted as fitter grade-II after 8 years of service and he has been performing different type of duties, sometime helper to keyman and sometimes meter reader etc. R.W.2 Shri Hemant Kumar has also supported the version of the respondent management that the petitioner is a mazdoor and not a fitter grade-II (keyman). I have perused the mustroll shown to me by the representative of the respondent and his status has been described as a mazdoor in the aforesaid mustroll. Shri Hari Ram, who has appeared as his own witness as P.W.1, admits that sometimes he is working as a mazdoor and sometimes as a keyman (Fitter grade-II) and no junior person to him has been appointed as a fitter grade-II (Keyman) by the respondents. He admits in cross-examination that the seniority list was circulated and his name appears at serial number 47 of the seniority list. In nutshell the case of the petitioner is false as he was never appointed as Fitter Grade-II (keyman) by the respondents. He has been shown as Beldar according to the seniority list placed on record by the respondent management and is at S. No. 47. He has not challenged the seniority list or any wrong promotions made by the management on the basis of the said seniority list. Merely that he was casually tendering the assistance to the fitter, does not confer upon him the status of fitter grade-II (keyman). He never complained that the work of fitter grade-II (keyman) was

being taken from him by the respondents and he should be given the wages of that post. He never approached the court for difference of wages or any other competent authority. There is no evidence on record to show that he has been victimised on account of the trade union activities as alleged by him. I, therefore, for the reasons recorded decide this issue accordingly in favour of the respondent management and against the petitioner.

Relief:

6. In view of my findings on issues and the reasons recorded, I pass an award accordingly in favour of the respondent management and against the petitioner. The petitioner is not entitled to any relief at this stage. Reference is answered in negative. Let a copy of this award be sent to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla for its due publication in the official gazette, i.e. Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra in accordance with the law. A copy of this award be also given to the parties free of costs, if applied for by them. The parties are, however, left to bear their own costs of these proceedings. The file after its due completion be consigned to the record room.

Announced on this 24th day of June, 1992, at Shimla.

Seal.

R. K. MAHAJAN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, H.P.
Shimla-1. 24-6-1992.

Before Shri R. K. Mahajan Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla

Ref. Case-45/91-

Jagna Ram.

..Petitioner.

Versus

M/S Khanna Watches, Parwanoo, District Solan, H.P.

..Respondents.

Shri A. K. Sharma, Authorised Representative of the petitioner.

Shri V. K. Gupta, Authorised Representative of the respondents.

AWARD

The Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla vide its notification dated the 21st March, 1991, referred the following dispute to this court for adjudication under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter shortly referred to the 'Act') on failure of the conciliation proceedings between the parties :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Jagna Ram S/o Nathi Ram by the Management of M/S Khanna Watches, Limited, Parwanoo, District Solan (HP) w.e.f. 29-8-1989 is legal and justified? If illegal, to what service benefits and relief, Shri Jagna Ram is entitled?”

2. The petitioner was employed as a Compressor operator by the respondent management on 12-3-1982 @Rs. 600/- per month. The petitioner alleges that he was a Propaganda Secretary of the Khanna Watches, Karamchari Sangh and as such the management was biased against him on account of trade union activities and terminated his services on 22-1-1989.

2. Lock out was lifted as a result of settlement arrived at between the parties. The petitioner was not allowed to join duty. The petitioner describes his termination arbitrary, illegal and tainted with unfair labour practice. He prays for his re-instatement with all consequential benefits.

4. The case of the respondent management is that the petitioner was chargesheeted for his misconduct

on account of stoppage of compressor in the factory on 8-7-1989 which caused loss in the working of the machinery as well as factory. Mr. V. K. Gupta, representative of the respondents, who is conducting this case, was appointed as the Enquiry Officer to go into the charges against the petitioner and he came to the conclusion after conducting the enquiry and vide its report, Ex.RW.1/A that the petitioner Jagna Ram wilfully refused to carry out the instructions of the Manager, Shri Kulwant Singh twice to re-start the Air Compressor and this act of the petitioner was considered to be highly subversive and indisciplined. Mr. Jagna Ram was also guilty of switching off the Compressor on 8-7-1989 at about 1.30. P.M., in order to report to a strike in the factory. Later on, after getting the explanation of the petitioner, the respondent management ordered the enquiry against him by appointing Shri V. K. Gupta, as the Enquiry Officer. The petitioner raised an objection through the Presenting Officer on 24-7-1989 by way of submitting an application to change the Enquiry Officer as Shri V. K. Gupta was not acceptable to him as Enquiry Officer in his case. According to the petitioner, Shri Gupta was not fair and impartial. The respondent management did not accede to the request of the petitioner and the petitioner did not participate in the Enquiry Proceedings despite knowledge of the enquiry being conducted against him as is apparent from the report of the Enquiry Officer placed on record and other connected record which need not be mentioned here. It has also been alleged by the respondents that the petitioner was not victimised on account of trade union activities as alleged by him. In fact, there was no question of joining on 22-11-1989 in the factory by the petitioner and refusal of the management to take him back on duty as it was a public holiday on that day in the factory on account of Lok Sabha Elections under section 25 of the Negotiable Instrument Act. It is further denied that the lock out in the factory and later on strike in the month of September, 1989 has no connection with the termination of the petitioner. From the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed by me on 5-9-1991 :—

1. Whether the services of the petitioner have been terminated unjustifiably? If so, its effect? (OPP).
2. Whether the termination has been done after conducting the enquiry? (OPR).
3. Relief.

FINDINGS ON ISSUES

Issue No. 1 & 2.

5. Both these issues are inter-connected and would be disposed off together in order to avoid the duplicity in discussion.

6. Mr. A.K.Sharma, representative of the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been victimised on account of his trade union activities as he was a Propaganda Secretary of the workers' union of the respondent factory. There was a strike and lock out and later on a settlement was arrived at between the parties as a result of which the lock out was lifted. This happened as union had submitted some demands regarding bonus etc. vide Ex.R.1. It is further submitted by him that the enquiry was not conducted in a fair and impartial manner as the Enquiry Officer conducted the enquiry and later on he conducted this case in this court. The respondent management has refuted the allegation levelled by the petitioner. I am of the view after hearing the parties and from the material placed on record that the petitioner was charged for offence of switching off the compressor which is not warranted by the industrial discipline. The petitioner was a propaganda secretary of the workers' union and he should not have hesitated to take part in the enquiry proceedings and rebut the charges levelled against him. The petitioner was having a grievance that Mr. Gupta was not an independent enquiry officer and as such he did not take part in the enquiry proceedings. Mr. Gupta has submitted who is conducting this case in this court that

he is not adviser of the respondent company and he is only a legal consultant. He has further submitted that there is no bar to conduct the enquiry and to conduct the case in this court on the analogy of the Managing Director, who can perform both jobs i.e. holding of enquiry and appearing in the court. Technically, there is no bar but it is desirable that justice which is rooted into confidence, and appointment of enquiry officer must inspire a confidence to an ordinary worker that is a famous dictum *that justice should not be done but should manifestly and undoubtly be seen to be done. Justice must be rooted in confidence and confidence is destroyed when rightminded people go away thinking "Judge was biased"*. In view of this, it is desirable that as far as possible, the enquiry officers, who are not employees of the company should restrain themselves from appearing in the courts to conduct the cases to avoid oblique prejudice. In this case, the worker has also committed impropriety by not defending his case before the enquiry officer. The enquiry officer has based his enquiry report on evidence of the concerned officers officials in whose presence the switching off was made by the petitioner. The enquiry officer also did not send the copy of findings to the petitioner on the ground that he was proceeded *ex-parte* due to non-participation. In the facts and circumstances of this case, the findings of the Enquiry Officer are not unreasonable and I would not like to record the evidence afresh as no vehement request has been made by either parties in writing. I further consider that punishment inflicted on the petitioner is too harsh and unreasonable in the light of background that the petitioner was an activist of the trade union movement. The trade unionist was further entertaining some other prejudices which may not have very strong foundations. The relations between the parties are strained and it would be undesirable to reinstate the petitioner with minor penalties under section 11(A) of the Act but ends of justice would be met if he is given compensation of Rs. 25000/- (Twenty five thousand) only besides other legal dues. I uphold the findings of the enquiry officer and termination of the petitioner with modification as mentioned. Both these issues are decided accordingly.

Relief:

6. In view of my findings on issues and the reasons recorded, I pass an award accordingly in terms of the aforesaid discussion on issues upholding the findings of the enquiry officer and subsequent termination of the services of the petitioner by the respondent management. However, I order the respondent management to pay to the petitioner a sum of Rs. 25,000/- (Twenty five Thousand) only as compensation as it would end the ego of both the parties to agitate the matter at the higher level as my experience is that the managements do not Re-employ despite court orders and proper paying without assigning duty the dismissed workers in such circumstances and make it a question of their prestige. Reference is answered accordingly. Let a copy of this award be sent to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-2, for its due publication in the official gazette i.e. Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra in accordance with the law. A copy of this award be supplied to the parties free of costs if applied for by them. The parties are, however, left to bear their own costs of these proceedings. The file be consigned to the record room after its due completion. The payment be made to the petitioner within one month from the publication failing which interest of 12% will be payable to the petitioner by the management on the above amount.

Announced on this 21st day of July 1992 at Shimla.

Seal.

R. K. MAHAJAN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, H.P.
Shimla-1. 21-7-1992.

Before Shri R.K. Mahajan, Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla

Ref-Case No.33/39

S/Shri Chaman Lal and others. ..Petitioners.

Versus

M/S Baira Sieul Project, Surangani, District Chamba (HP). ..Respondents.

Shri Dani Chand, Authorised Representative of the petitioners.

Shri V.K. Gupta, Authorised Representative of the respondents.

AWARD

1. The Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla vide its notification, dated the 21st March, 1989, referred the following dispute to this court for adjudication under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Hereinafter shortly referred to as the 'Act') on failure of the conciliation proceedings between the parties.—

“Whether the action of the Management of M/s Baira Sieul Project to promote junior workmen like S/Shri Gurcharan Singh, Shanti Lal, S. N. Jha, Bhim Sen and Pritam Singh by superseding S/Shri Chaman Lal, Narotam Singh, Piare Lal from the Pay Scale of Rs. 260-400 to Rs. 350-560 w.e.f. 1-8-1978 is fair and justified and as also whether the D. P. C's decision of dated 31-8-1978 granting simply two advance increments to Shri Pitamber Nath instead of promoting him in the higher grade of Rs. 350-560 w.e.f. 1-11-1978 is fair and justified? If not, to what relief S/Shri Chaman Lal, Narotam Singh, Piare Lal and Pitamber Nath are entitled?”

2. Shri Chaman Lal, Narotam Singh, Piare Lal and Pitamber Nath petitioners claim that they joined as Work Assistants in civil circle of the respondent Project. For example, Chaman Lal joined on 3-4-1974, Narotam Singh on 30-11-1974, Piare Lal on 30-11-1974 and Pitamber Nath on 1-7-1973 in the pay scale of Rs. 260-400. Their grievance is that Gurcharan Singh, Shanti Lal, S. N. Jha, Bhim Sen who joined on 28-9-1974, 4-11-1974, 16-1-76 and 1-11-1975 were promoted after six months to 240 days' gap. They have been shown juniors as alleged by them as per EX. P.W. 1/A and P. W. 1/B. It is also alleged by the petitioners that one Raghubir Singh was also given promotion from 1-8-77 in the pay scale of Rs. 330-560 when they were junior to the petitioners. The plea of the petitioners is that the seniority was Projectwise and promotion of the workers circlewise was unjustified and illegal. It is also asserted in their claim petition that one Shri Pitamber Nath was not considered for promotion by the respondent management whereas his juniors were promoted in November, 1977 and 1978. Pitamber Nath has also challenged the grant of two advance increments to him by the D. P. C. instead of his regular promotion in the cadre despite excellent record of his service. The petitioners pray that they may be given promotion retrospectively along with arrears in the scale of Rs. 330-560.

3. The case of the respondent management is that the work-charged staff of Baira Sieul Project, Surangani is governed by the C. P. W. D. manual, S/Shri Chaman Lal and other petitioners were in different circles having a different seniority. It is denied that the seniority was maintained projectwise and not circlewise. It is also revealed from the statement of Mr. Tirki Deputy Manager, (Personnel) of the respondents that some cases of hardship were to be reviewed and there is a mention of those cases in Ex. R. W. 1/A and R. W. 1/D. In the last settlement, R.W. 1/D, no past cases were to be re-opened as per this settlement. It appears that the project was completed in the year, 1982 and some of the staff became surplus. Some offered for voluntary retraining scheme and some others did not opt and they continued working in some work with the hope that in case there would be

a demand, they would be transferred to Chamera Project and ultimately they were transferred to Chamera Project in May, 1985. Admittedly, the Baira Sieul Project was transferred to the control of the N. H. P. C. from the Ministry of Energy, Government of India on 20-1-1978 along with the assets and liabilities. It is also alleged that there is no relationship of Master and Servant between the petitioners and the management as they were the employees of the Chamera Project at the time of reference and as such their plea is not tenable. It has also been alleged that relief can only be granted from the date of demand notice and not retrospectively. The plea of the management is that they have not disturbed their status in which they had been working. Their scale has been duly protected. The dispute being a stale one, cannot be agitated at this stage. The status of the union to raise this Dispute has also been challenged on the grounds that the dispute is of a general nature and does not fall under the Act. In other words, it is a dispute between four workmen and the Chamera Hydel Project as alleged by the respondent management. It was for the Chamera Project to revise their scales. It is also submitted that two advance increments were given to Shri Pitamber Nath, who was not considered fit for promotion and but for meritorious service.

Lastly, the respondent management has pleaded that it is a stale claim and cannot be agitated at this stage as it may destabilise the settled conditions of so many workers. From the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed by me on 1-12-1990:—

1. Whether S/Shri Chaman Lal, Narotam Singh, Pitamber Nath and Pyare Lal have been ignored from promotion qua juniors S/Shri Shanti Lal, Bhim Sen, S. N. Jha without justification and if so, its effect? (OPP).
2. Whether the dispute is not Industrial Dispute as alleged? (OPR).
3. Whether there was a relationship of employer and employee at the time of the dispute? (OPR).
4. Whether the dispute cannot be espoused by the Chamera Pariyojna Karamchhari Sangh? (OPR).
5. Relief.

FINDINGS ON ISSUES

Issue No. 1 :

4. Shri Duni Chand, representative of the petitioners has submitted that seniority is Projectwise and petitioners have been ignored unjustifiably. I have gone through the record placed on record as well as the statement of Mr. Tirki, Deputy Manager (Personnel) of the respondent management, who appeared as R. W. 1 and that of Shri Chaman Lal, who appeared as P. W. 1. I do not find the contention of the representative of the petitioner well merited. Shri Chaman Lal, petitioner has admitted that he was in Baira Sieul Project before his transfer to Chamera Project in May, 1985. He has expressed lack of knowledge whether 1000 workers became surplus after the completion of the respondent Project. He also expressed lack of knowledge whether seniority was circlewise or Projectwise. He admits that he was in civil circle prior to 1978. Some of the persons mentioned in EX. P. W. 1/A were in Mechanical as well as in Electrical circle. He also admits that the promotions were effected by the D. P. C. but denies that they were to be made on the basis of merit-cum-seniority. It is an admitted fact that workers became surplus in the respondent Project and they were to be absorbed in the Chamera Project. The Project i.e. Chamera kept their status undisturbed along with their emoluments. The petitioners case falls to the ground when he admits that the promotions used to take place Circlewise and not projectwise. Now a days, it is effected Projectwise. It is very difficult and not practicable when the Projects are on initial stages and later on they are completed, to maintain the seniority lists Projectwise. Different circles may not be required i.e. Electrical Wing, Civil Wing and Surveyor Wing to carry on the work as they have to be created with the passage of the time as the Project progresses. The respondent Project in its initial stage faced difficulty and seniority was maintained

circlewise. I would like to quote Rule 9.04, Rule No. 1 : A. Circle shall, ordinarily be treated as a unit for seniority of work-charged personnel in each category separately. In certain cases, however, where Divisions or Sub-divisions are located far away from Headquarters of the circle of the Divisions concerned, the Engineer-in-Chief determines whether the Divisions or Sub-Divisions should be treated as units for seniority. The Manual also lays emphasis on seniority circlewise. The settlements arrived at between the parties from time to time reveal that the management has considered ignored cases and if any case of hardship was left, it was the duty of the petitioners to point out the same in time. In my view, the stale matters cannot be agitated now at this stage in view of the circlewise seniority and promotions on the basis of merit-cum-seniority. Even the petitioners have been given promotions w. e. f. 1-11-1983 by virtue of settlement, dated 19-6-1984 and 1-10-1984, placed on record. It does not now lie in the mouth of the petitioners to rake up the matter especially when they have been given the benefit by way of a package deal through the settlements placed on record. I have also held in so many cases of similar nature of the respondent management that the settlements are valid. I, therefore, for the reasons recorded decide this issue accordingly in favour of the respondent management and against the petitioners. I also hold that Shri Pitamber Nath has also been rightly given the benefit of two advance increments by the respondent management as an incentive to avoid stagnation as he was not found suitable for promotion.

Issue No. 2, 3 and 4 :

5. All these issues are inter-connected and would be disposed off together in order to avoid the duplicity in discussion.

6. The dispute between the parties of an industrial nature and it has been properly espoused by the union. The question of relationship of master and servant between the parties is of technical nature as point of reference has been decided against the petitioners Baira Sieul Project still exists and the petitioners are claiming the benefits of the past period when they were the employees of the respondent Project and as such the reference is valid and it has been rightly espoused by the Chamera Pariyojna Karamchhari Sangh. I, therefore, for the reasons recorded decide all these issues against the respondent management and in favour of the petitioners.

RELIEF

7. In view of my findings on issues and the reasons recorded, I pass an award accordingly in favour of the respondent management and against the petitioners holding that they are not entitled to any relief at this stage. Reference is answered in negative. Let a copy of this award be sent to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-2, for its due publication in the official gazette i.e. Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra in accordance with the law. A copy be also supplied to the parties free of costs, if applied for by them. The parties are, however, left to bear their own costs of these proceedings. The file after its due completion, be consigned to the record room.

Announced on this 16th day of July, 1992, at Shimla.

R. K. MAHAJAN,
Seal, Presiding Officer, Labour Court,
Himachal Pradesh, Shimla.
16-7-1992.

Before Shri R. K. Mahajan, Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla

Ref-Case No. 143/90

Tek Chand

Petitioner.

Versus

M/s Baira Sieul Project
N. H. P. C. Surangani, District
Chamba, Himachal Pradesh Respondents.

Shri Duni Chand, Authorised Representative of the petitioner.

Shri V. K. Gupta, Authorised Representative of the Respondents.

AWARD

1. The Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla vide its notification, dated the 28th October, 1990, referred the following dispute to this Court for adjudication under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Hereinafter shortly referred to as the 'Act') on failure of the conciliation proceedings between the parties.

"Whether the action of the Management of Baira Sieul Hydel Project, Surangani, District Chamba, Himachal Pradesh in drawing up the Seniority Lists of the Assistant Grade-III, II and I during the year, 1980, 1983, 1984, 1987 and 1989 without inviting objections from the concerned workmen and without taking any decisions thereon for the above posts is legal and justified? If illegal, To what position in the seniority lists of the year, 1980, 1983, 1984, 1987 and 1989, Shri Tek Chand is entitled?"

2. Shri Tek Chand petitioner alleges that he was appointed by the respondent management as Assistant Grade-III on 12-1-1976 at Surangani. He was promoted later on according to the rules as Assistant Grade-II w. e. f. 1-3-1991. He was shown at serial number 7 of the seniority list at the time of promotion. According to him, the criteria for promotion was on the basis of the seniority subject to the suitability. It appears that the respondent management again circulated a revised seniority list vide office order, dated 21-3-1983 superseding the earlier seniority list on the basis of the panel drawn up by the management at the time of interview. It is seriously contended by him that such panel was never drawn up by the respondents. Objections were invited and the petitioner alongwith affected employees submitted their objections, if any, to the management. The matter was taken up by the union with the management and again seniority list issued earlier was confirmed which is Annexure 2 i. e. seniority list drawn up in 1980 was confirmed in which he has been shown at serial number 7 in the category of Assistant Grade-III. On the basis of this seniority list, promotion was effected as Assistant Grade w. e. f. 1-7-86 vide order, dated 10-2-1984. The petitioner nursed a serious grievance against the respondent management when his position was disturbed in the seniority list and he was brought at serial number 10 from serial number in the category of the Assistant Grade-I. This was effected on the basis of a panel. The petitioner made representations but of no use and again a seniority list was circulated on 19-8-1989, Annexure-III and the petitioner was shown at serial number 3. It is admitted by the respondent management as alleged by the petitioner that previously seniority list was drawn up on the basis of date of joining on account of non availability of panel of selection. He prays that seniority list, dated 19-8-1989 may be set aside and his position at serial number 2 of the seniority list of the Assistant Grade-II be restored and his juniors may not be promoted to the post of Superintendent by disturbing his position.

3. The case of the respondent as revealed from the written statement filed by them is that the seniority list has been drawn up on the basis of the panel as some of the Assistants who have been affected, located the panel. It is further averred by the respondent management that there is no vacancy of office superintendent available in the respondent project and the apprehension of the petitioner is ill founded. It is also alleged that the management by rectifying the mistake, has done a justice to the workers who were victims of the injustice as the panel was not traceable. The management has further considered the representation of the petitioner but found no merit in accepting the same. From the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed by me on 25-4-1991:—

1. Whether the seniority of the petitioner has been

changed unjustifiably and illegally as alleged? (OPP).

2. Whether order of reference is illegal? (OPR).

3. Whether the claim petition is not signed by the petitioner? (OPR).

4. Whether the reference is bad for misjoinder of parties? (OPR).

5. Relief.

FINDING ON ISSUES

Issue No. 1 :

4. Mr. Duni Chand, representative of the petitioner has submitted that the action of the respondent management is illegal by changing the seniority list off and on and disturbing the position of the petitioner without giving him a proper hearing. He has further submitted that seniority list could not be changed after such a long lapse of time. The representative of the respondent has submitted that as soon as the panel was traced out, the seniority list was changed on the representations of the workers who had been ignored. I agree with the plea of the respondent management and I hold that the management was fully justified in changing the seniority list as soon as the panel was traced out. I have seen the panel i. e. result of the typing test held on 14-9-75. The employees who qualified the type test, were to be absorbed into the regular cadre of the respondent project. This test has shown the speed of each worker and it has been prepared according to the speed. Tek Chand, petitioner's speed was 18.7 words per minute and even then he was absorbed by the management. He should be thankful to the management rather than raking up this issue. The management is not claiming the recovery of the past benefits extended to the petitioner. R. W. I, Anil Gaikwarh, Personnel Officer of the management has explained while appearing in the witness box that in fact panel was lying with one official who was later on transferred to Devighat in Nepal and when he returned, panel was traced out and a fresh seniority list on the basis of this panel was drawn up by the management sometime in the year, 1983. I have held in other cases also relating to the same project that the promotion is to be made on the basis of the panel and the tracing out of the panel has been held to be valid. I would like to quote N. H. P. C. personnel manual, 1982 (3.1) "If a promotion order contains names of more than one person, their seniority shall be according to the merit list drawn up by the Departmental Promotion Committee in accordance with the Promotion Rules". Even this rule says that promotion should be made on the basis of the panel. The representative of the petitioner's plea that it is a case of victimisation on account of trade union activities and it is not a panel is not based on record nor is there any evidence to the effect that the petitioner has been victimised on account of his trade union activities. The management has been giving opportunities to the petitioner for representation/objections, if any, against the seniority list and it cannot be said that no opportunity has been given, as revealed from the letter, dated 13-12-87 and other letters placed on record. I, therefore, for the reasons recorded hold that the petitioner has been rightly placed in the final seniority list and prepared on the basis of panel by the respondent and no prejudice/injustice has been caused to him. I decide this issue accordingly in favour of the respondent management and against the petitioner.

Issue No. 2, 3 and 4 :

5. All these issues are inter-connected and would be disposed off together in order to avoid the duplicity in discussion. These issues are not the subject matter of reference and I need not answer these issues strictly speaking. However, the plea raised by the respondent that it is not an industrial dispute as revealed from the written statement, is not valid. The matter has been sponsored by the union and it relates to the seniority list and such it is covered under the definition of industrial dispute section 2(k) of the Act. The management has been made a party and as such it is not a case of misjoinder of the parties pleading

of all the workers was not essential when the management itself was pleading their cause. There is no force in other submissions nor these have been agitated seriously. As regards the signatures of the petitioner on the claim petition, It is not necessary at all especially when the petition has been signed by his authorised representative and the dispute has been espoused by the union. I, therefore for the reasons recorded decide all these issues accordingly in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent management.

RELIEF

6. In view of my findings on issues and the reasons recorded, I pass an award accordingly in favour of the respondent management and against the petitioner holding that the petitioner is not entitled to any relief at this stage. Reference is answered in negative and the award is passed accordingly. Let a copy of this award be sent to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-2, for its due publication in the official gazettee i. e. Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra in accordance with the law. A copy of this award be given to the parties free of costs, if applied for by them. The parties are, however, left to bear their own costs of these proceedings. The file after its due completion, be consigned to the record room.

Announced on this 13th day of July, 1992, at Shimla

Seal.

R. K. MAHAJAN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, (H. P.) Shimla.
13-7-1992.

Before Shri R. K. Mahajan, Presiding Officer, Labour
Court, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla

Ref-156/88

Subash Chander

.. Petitioner.

Versus

Management of M/s Baira Sieul Project,

Surgani, District Chamba, Himachal Pradesh

.. Respondents.

Shri T.R. Bhardawaj, Authorised Representative of the
petitioner.

Shri V K Gupta, Authorised Representative of the
respondents.

AWARD

The Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla vide its notification, dated the 10th October, 1988, referred the following dispute to this court for adjudication under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter shortly referred to as the 'Act') on failure of the conciliation proceedings between the parties—

1. "Whether the action of the management is justified in ignoring Shri Subash Chander, Works Assistant in the pay scale of Rs. 260—350/- from promotion to the post of Assistant Grade-II in the pay scale of Rs. 330—560/- on the basis of circle wise work Assistant were inter circle Transferable? If not, to and what relief and amount of compensation, Shri Subash Chander is entitled?"
2. "Whether the action of the management of M/s Baira Sieul Project, Surgani, District Chamba is justified in promoting junior work assistants, S/Shri Gurcharan Singh, Shanti Lal, Reghubir Singh, Pritam Singh by ignoring Senior work assistant Shri Subash Chander from promotion a Assistant in the Pay Scale of Rs 330—560, w. e. f. 1-11-1977? If not, to what relief and amount of compensation, Shri Subash Chander is entitled?"

2. The petitioner Shri Subash Chander claims that he was appointed in the respondent Project on 19-7-1974 as work assistant in the pay scale of Rs. 260—350. His grievance is that S/Shri Gurcharn Singh, Shanti Lal, Raghubir Singh and Pritam Singh, who were junior to him, were promoted as Asstt. Grade-II in the pay scale of Rs. 330—560 and he had joined earlier to them. The petitioner has filed EX-P-I reflecting the petition of his own regarding the date of joining vis-a-vis the workers who were allegedly junior to him. The petitioner further alleges that there is nothing adverse against him and as such he has been ignored arbitrarily. His main grievance is that seniority was at the Project level for all the categories of workers as the posts were transferable from one circle to another within the Project. The respondent management's action in ignoring the seniority list Ex. P. 2 is not tenable and is a violation of C. P. W. D. manual Rule 9.4. It is also alleged by him that no option was taken from him at the time of his transfer of the respondent project to Hydroelectric and Power Corporation of India from the Ministry of Energy, Government of India on 20-1-1978. He also alleges that Manjoor Ahmed has been promoted from back date whereas he has not been given that treatment. He pray for his promotion from the date, his junior were promoted with all consequential benefits.

4. The case of the respondent management is that the seniority was circle wise and the management has rightly promoted the workers. Previously, the project was with the Ministry of Energy, Government of India and it was transferred to the National Hydroelectric and Power Corporation of India on 20-1-1978. The management could not disturb the status and position with regard to the promotions already made as it was a stipulation of the taking over of the management of the respondent Project by the National Hydroelectric and Power Corporation from the Government of India on 20-1-1978. It was also alleged that there were some anomalies after taking over of the respondent project by the Corporation with respect to the promotions etc and an agreement was arrived at between the parties and the management reviewed all the left out cases including the case of the petitioner and he was promoted w.e.f. 1-11-1983 in the pay scale of Rs. 330—560. Settlement is dated 1-10-1984 placed on record and this settlement has been upheld in so many similar cases by this court. Annexure of Clause 16(b) of the settlement is placed on record with the C.P.W.D. Manual. It is also alleged that reference is not maintainable as the dispute is between the individual workman and the management and is not properly espoused by the union and it relates to the previous employers. From the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed by me on 6-9-1990 :—

1. Whether the petitioner was senior as alleged? (OPP).
2. Whether the petitioner has been illegally ignored from promotion? If not to what effect? (OPP)
3. Whether the reference does not fall under the Industrial Disputes Act? (OPR).
4. Whether the respondent is not liable for payment of earlier dues to the petitioner as he was in the employment of Baira Sieul Project? (OPR).
5. Relief.

FINDINGS ON ISSUES

Issue No. 1 & 2:

5. Both issue No. 1 and 2 are inter-connected and would be disposed off together in order to avoid the duplicity in discussion.

6. The representative of the petitioner Shri T. R. Bhardwaj has submitted that the promotion should have been made on the basis of the seniority Projectwise and not circlewise. He further submits that the petitioner who had joined earlier, was not promoted whereas juniors to him, have been promoted and it is a great

injustice done to the petitioner by the respondent management. Mr. V. K. Gupta, representative of the respondents has submitted that the promotions were in accordance with the rules contained in the C.P.W.D. Manual, and promotions have been effected circlewise. I am of the view after hearing the representative of the parties that there is a separate electrical circle and similarly other circles. The management has to maintain seniority of separate circles as the workers have different trades. Each circle is opened for requirements of the work. Promotions also are done considering the avenues of promotions in each circle in a particular line for which a circle has been created. I would like to quote Rule No.1 of 9.04 of the C.P.W.D. Manual. It lays down. A circle shall, ordinarily be treated as a unit for seniority of work-charged personnel in each category separately. In certain cases however, where divisions or sub-divisions located far away from headquarters of the circle of the division concerned the Engineer-in-Chief determines whether the division or the sub-division to be treated as unit for seniority. Normally no transfer is to be made from one unit to another as laid down under rule 4 of C.P.W.D. manual except in exceptional circumstances which have not been brought on record and as such the plea of petitioner loses its significance. Normally no transfer is to be made from one unit to another under rule 4 of C.P.W.D. manual except in exceptional circumstances which have not been brought on record and as such the plea of petitioner loses its significance. The respondent vide P. 4 (copy of the letter showing that circle was treated as unit for the purpose of seniority) has treated the circle as the unit for the purpose of the seniority. D. P. C. proceedings of 1977 with respect to the work assistant grade-III of the mechanical circle, have been placed on record and criteria was circlewise and not projectwise as alleged. The promotions were made on the basis of seniority-cum-merit and the name of the petitioner did not figure in the proceedings of the D. P. C. Shri A. N. Jha was promoted on account of incentive him for undergoing the vasectomy operation and excellent performance. I have also held in similar other cases the criteria of seniority as circlewise and not projectwise. I do not find any merit in the submissions of the representative of the petitioner. The case of the petitioner is also weak as there was a package deal between the parties and agreement was arrived at on 1-1-1984 and so many workers including the petitioner were promoted by the management as a result of this package deal w.e.f. 1-11-1983 which the petitioner has also accepted. The union representatives were there and they struck a package deal in the interest of the petitioner for the benefit of the workers in order to achieve great justice. The case of the petitioner was also given promotion w.e.f. 1-11-1983 as a result of this package. It does not now lie in the mouth of the petitioner to open the settled case at this stage which has been settled in a process of bargaining. Moreover the aforesaid settled between the parties has been arrived at in the presence of the Conciliation Officer (Ex.P.6) and it is binding on the parties under section 18(3) of the Act and settlements are not to be ignored by the concerned parties otherwise the sanctity of the settlement will lose its significance. Regarding giving of benefits to Majeer Ahmed, it has no relevance with the instant case. I, therefore, for the reasons recorded and in the facts and surrounding circumstances of this case, decide both the issues accordingly in favour of the respondent management and against the petitioner. I hold that the action of the management with respect to the promotion of the workers circlewise is fully legal and justified. Even otherwise, the contention of the petitioner cannot be accepted as the cloak cannot be put back by 15 or 20 years by opening the stale cases at this belated stage which is also not warranted in the interest of justice and the industrial peace.

Issue No. 3 and 4:

6. Both these issues are also inter-connected and would be disposed off together in order to avoid the duplication in discussion.

7. In my view promotion of ignored workers, if properly sponsored by the union falls within the definition of under section 2(k) the Act. The matter has

been referred through the Union General Secretary, Shri D.R. Nirdoshi through the process of conciliation and as such it is an industrial dispute and falls within the purview of the Act. As regards the payment of earlier due, this issue has become superfluous in view of findings above on the other issues. Besides, this is also not a subject matter of the reference and hence need not be answered. I, therefore, for the reasons recorded decide issues No. 3 in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent management while issue No. 4 is decided in favour of the respondent management and against the petitioner.

RELIEF

8. In view of my findings on issues and the reasons recorded, I pass an award accordingly in favour of the respondent management and against the petitioner holding that the petitioner is not entitled to any relief at this stage. Reference is answered in negative. Let a copy of this award be sent to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-2, for its due publication in the official gazettee i.e. Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra in accordance with law. A copy be also given to the parties free of costs, if applied for them. The parties are, however, left to bear their own costs of these proceedings. The file be consigned to the record room after its due completion.

Announced on this 20th day of July, 1992, at Shimla.

S.al.

R. K. MAHAJAN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, (H.P.),
Shimla, 20-7-1992.

Before Shri R. K. Mahajan, Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla

Ref-153/90

Sangram Singh

Petitioner.

Versus

M/s Baira Sieul Project, Surangani, District Chamba (HP)
.. Respondents.

Shri T. R. Bhardwaj, Authorised Representative of the Petitioner.

Shri V. K. Gupta, Authorised Representative of the Respondents

AWARD

1. The Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla vide its notification, dated the 4th August, 1990, has referred the following dispute to this court for adjudication under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter shortly referred to as the 'Act') on failure of the conciliation proceedings between the parties :-

"Whether the action of the management of Baira Sieul Hydroelectric Project, Surangani, District Chamba (HP) in bringing Shri Sangram Singh workman on serial No. 3 from serial No. 1 of the seniority list of Assistant Grade-II vide its order No. 3484, dated 30-12-1987, is legal and justified? If illegal, what should be the position of Shri Sangram Singh, workman in the seniority list?"

2. The petitioner claims that he was appointed as Work Sarkar in the respondent Project in the year, 1973 in the pay scale of Rs. 85-110. According to him, he was promoted as a Lower Division Clerk in the year, 1973 and he joined duty on 1-1-1974. There were some posts of Lower Division Clerks lying vacant as revealed in Ex.R.W.1/A and it was thought proper by the respondent to appoint the lower division clerks from the workers who qualified the type test and an interview was also held to fill up the posts at Surangani, Sundla

and Saloori. The names of the workers who were sponsored by the Employment Exchange and who qualified the type test were considered for appointment. The petitioner was also one of them. The petitioner claims that he was promoted as Assistant Grade-II and in seniority list, he was shown at serial number one. Seniority list, dated 17th/18th March, 1980, Annexure P-2 is placed on record. Later on, another seniority list was prepared and issued on 21-3-1983 by the respondents and the petitioner has been shown at serial No. 3 of the said list as alleged by the petitioner. Seniority list, dated 29-2-1980 is a provisional seniority list of the Assistants Grade-II and the seniority list, dated 21-3-1983, issued by the respondent management is the final seniority list of the Assistants Grade-II in which the petitioner has been shown at serial number 3. This list was prepared on the basis of date of joining of the individuals on account of non-availability of panel of selection and pertains to the categories of Assistants Grade-II and Grade-III of the respondent project. It appears from the claim petition filed by the petitioner that he has been shown at serial number one in another seniority list, dated 31-12-83 P. 9 (Page 14) placed on record. The petitioner has been promoted on the basis of the seniority list as Assistant Grade-I on 8-2-1984. The real trouble started and the petitioner entertains serious grievance when another seniority list was issued on 30-12-1987. Annexure P. 11, in which he has been shown at serial Number 3 of the seniority list of the Assistant Grade-I (Scale of Rs. 485-800) as on 29-12-1987. It has been alleged by the petitioner that he made various representations to the authorities placed on record viz. P.12, P.13, P.14 raising his grievance against the seniority list. The matter was also taken up through the union and also came in discussion between the representatives of the union and the management but of no use. Ultimately the petitioner's representation was rejected vide P.15 in May, 89 the seniority list dated 30-12-1987 issued by the respondents was upheld. It may be pointed out that vide Annexure P. 11, the petitioners were given opportunity to represent against the tentative seniority list which was going to be revised after the availability of panel, which was not traceable.

3. The case of the respondent is that the petitioner was admittedly a Superintendent in the office and he was not a worker and as such the reference is not maintainable. It is also pleaded that it is an individual dispute and does not fall under the purview of section 2 (A) of the Act. The respondent has asserted that the panel was not available and as soon as the panel was traced, the seniority list was prepared on the basis of the merit as reflected in the panel and it was duly circulated. Representations were invited and entertained. The management under various pressures of the workers' unions finalised the seniority lists of Assistant Grade-II after inviting the objections/representations of the concerned workers. The management in order to do justice to the workers, who had been ignored earlier and who enjoyed a better merit than the petitioner, rectified the seniority list after completing the formalities and the petitioner cannot take the advantage of wrong state of things. The management has also denied that there was any victimisation of the petitioner on account of trade union activities as alleged. From the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed by me on 12-6-1991 :-

1. Whether showing of Sangram Singh at serial No.3 instead of serial number 1 vide seniority list, dated 30-12-1987 is in order? (OPP).
2. Whether the matter is not covered under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947? (OPR).
3. Relief.

FINDINGS

Issue No. 1:

4. Mr. Bhardwaj, representative of the petitioner has submitted that seniority list of the workers could not be changed as the worker had not been heard properly before the change in the said list. He further submits that Shri Sangram Singh was promoted with

other workers in Baira Sieul Project and National Hydroelectric Power Corporation had no right to set aside the promotion by way of changing the seniority list. It has been further submitted that seniority was finalised by the representatives of the management and workers' Union and it had been acted upon and as such it could not be changed prejudice to the interest of the workers. He further submitted that no selection panel was published and it was an eye wash. He has described the panel as not a genuine one.

5. Mr. Gupta, representative of the respondents has submitted that the respondent management was surprised and under pressure from the workers' Union, the seniority list was finalised on the basis of length of service and not on the basis of the merit as the panel was not at that time available. I am of the view that the management could rectify the seniority list in the year, 1987 on the basis of the panel Ex. RW.1/A prepared at the time of selection of lower division clerks. I have seen the original panel prepared by the management at the time of arguments. The photostat copy is placed on record. It does not seem to me a bogus one as alleged by the petitioner. It cannot be ruled out that this panel was not available, may be on different reasons, under the pressures of the workers' unions or otherwise, the management sometimes by time to ward off the trouble for carrying out the work smoothly. The management first of all, prepared a seniority list on the basis of length of service and later on, it was rectified when the selection panel was traced out. I have held in so many other connected cases of similar nature of the same management that selection has to be made on the basis of the merit and not on the basis of length of service in matters of promotions and seniority etc. Merit is the main criteria for higher promotions in such cases where panel has been drawn up. The petitioner has been duly heard as he made representations as discussed in earlier part of this award. Submissions of Mr. Bhardwaj, that the principles of natural justice, have been violated and seniority list has been changed after so many years, is not tenable in the facts and circumstances of this case. Rather the management is undoing a wrong done to the other workers and has achieved greater justice by preparing the seniority list on the basis of the panel. I direct the management that the monetary benefits already derived by the petitioner may not be recovered from him. However, I for the reasons recorded, decide this issue against the petitioner and in favour of the respondent management.

Issue No. 2:

6. I do not agree with the submissions of the respondents that the matter is not covered under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Once the matter has been referred by the Government, the Government has applied its mind regarding the nature of the dispute being industrial. The matter has been sponsored through the union. It is a matter of promotion and sponsoring the dispute through the union is sufficient to hold that it is an industrial dispute. The petitioner is a worker within the meaning of the Act. I, therefore, for the reasons recorded decide this issue accordingly in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent management.

RELIEF

7. In view of my findings on issues and the reasons recorded, I pass an award accordingly in favour of the respondent and against the petitioner holding that the petitioner is not entitled to any relief at this stage. Reference is answered in negative and award is passed accordingly. Let a copy of this award be sent to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-2, for its due publication in the official gazettee i.e. Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra in accordance with law. A copy be also given to the parties free of costs, if applied for by them. The parties are, however, left to bear their

own costs of these proceedings. The file after its due completion, be consigned to the record room.

Announced on this 10th day of July, 1992, at Shimla.

Seal. R. K. MAHAJAN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Himachal
Pradesh, Shimla. 10-7-1992.

Before Shri R. K. Mahajan, Presiding Officer, Labour
Court, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla

Ref-74/90-

S/Shri Man Singh and others .. Petitioners.

Versus

Assistant Engineer, H.P.P.W.D. Sub Division,
Salooni, District Chamba (H.P.) .. Respondents.

Shri T. R. Bhardwaj, Authorised Representative of
the petitioners.

Shri Major Singh, Authorised Representative of the
respondents.

AWARD

1. The Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla vide its notification, dated the 12th October, 1989, referred the following dispute to this court for adjudication under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Hereinafter shortly referred to as the 'Act') on failure of the conciliation proceedings between the parties:—

"Whether the termination of the services of the following workmen by the Assistant Engineer, H.P.P.W.D. Sub-Division, Salooni, District Chamba is legal and maintainable? If illegal to what relief and service benefits, the following workmen are entitled:—

1. Shri Man Singh s/o Sh. Bajna.
2. Shri Ram Krishan, s/o Sh. Hardayal.
3. Shri Bharat Singh s/o Sh. Baziru.
4. Shri Punnu s/o Shri Hardayal.
5. Shri Bharthu s/o Sh. Hardayal.
6. Shri Punnu s/o Shri Sucheta.
7. Shri Gian Chand s/o Shri Bainsu Ram.
8. Shri Jalam s/o Shri Dogru.
9. Shri Chamaru s/o Shri Sambhu.
10. Shri Baisu s/o Shri Prabh Dayal.
11. Shri Gian Chand, s/o Sh. Chimnu.
12. Shri Mohd. Hussain s/o Sh. Mussa.
13. Shri Budhi Singh, s/o Sh. Baisu Ram.
14. Shri Chamaru s/o Shri Bainsu Ram.
15. Shri Paras Ram s/o Sh. Baisu Ram.
16. Shri Dogru s/o Shri Kassour.

2. The petitioner claim that they were old worker with the respondent management since 1978 and their services were terminated by the respondent without compliance of section 25F and H of the Act. They have described their termination as illegal and unjustified and claim their re-instatement with all the consequential benefits.

3. The case of the respondent management in that their was no work and their services were terminated. It is also pleaded that the workers have not completed 240 days of continuous service with the respondent and as such there was no requirement of compliance of section 25 F and H of the Act by the respondent management. From the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed by me on 20-2-1991:—

1. Whether the termination of services of the Petitioner is unjustified by Management.

2. RELIEF.

FINDINGS ON ISSUES

Issue No. 1:

4. Vide my interim order, dated the 8th October, 1991 and 9th October, 1991, the respondent management has re-engaged the five workers in its employment namely, S/Shri Man Singh, Gian Chand, Chamaru, and Bainsu as their termination was found to be *prima facie* illegal as they had completed 240 days of continuous service with the respondent and compliance of Section 25 F and H of the Act was not made by the respondents. After recording the evidence of the petitioner by way of affidavits and examining their mustrolls and the seniority lists, and after perusing the statement of Shri Major Singh, representative of the respondents, I am of the view that these five workers have completed 240 days of continuous service with the respondents. Representative of the respondents has not been able to rebut by way of argument, or otherwise. I hold that their termination was illegal and unjustified by the respondents management and the same is quashed and set aside. There was a consensus type of settlement between the parties at the final stage of arguments during recent circuit at Dalhousie that the four other workers namely, Sh. Ram Kishan s/o Shri Hardiyal, Punnu s/o Suchetia, Budhi Singh s/o Shri Bainsu and Shri Bharthu s/o Shri Hardial would be re-engaged also by the management as they were not given the opportunity under section 25 H of the Act and this settlement was also acceptable to the petitioners for their re-engagement within a reasonable time.

5. Mr. Bhardwaj, representative of the petitioner has submitted that some token compensation may be given to petitioners but it was opposed by the respondent management on the grounds that there was no work. Considering the facts and circumstances of this case that no work was available for the petitioners though there was a violation of section 25 F of the Act, and also taking into consideration the reasonable attitude of the respondents, it would not be desirable to award the back wages or the compensation to the petitioners. I, therefore, for the reasons recorded decide this issue accordingly.

RELIEF

5. In view of my findings on issues and the reasons recorded, I pass an award accordingly and impugned order of termination of five workers engaged as per this court interim orders, dated 8/9th October, 1991 is quashed and set aside. They are deemed to be in the service of the respondents as if no termination order was passed. They would, however, not be entitled for any back wages or compensation but will be allowed the continuity of service. Regarding other four workers about whom the consensus settlement has been arrived at between the parties, they would be re-engaged by the respondent management within one month from today. They are also not entitled to any back wages or compensation including continuity of service as there is no merit in their case.

Regarding other remaining seven workers, the claim is not justified as there is no merit in their claim. Reference is answered accordingly. Let a copy of this award be sent to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-2, for its due publication in the official gazette i.e. Himachal Pradesh Rajpatra in accordance with the law. A copy be also supplied to the parties free of costs, if applied for by them. The parties are, however, left to bear their own costs of these proceedings. The file after its due completion be consigned to the record room.

Announced on this 22nd day of June, 1992, at Shimla.

Seal. R. K. MAHAJAN,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, (H.P.) Shimla.
22-6-1992.

Before Shri R. K. Mahajan, Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla

Ref-72/89-

Ameresh Kumar

...Petitioner.

Versus

Management of HRTC, Nahan, (H.P.)... Respondents.

Shri A.K.Gupta, Authorised Representative of the petitioner.

Shri K.C. Chouan, Authorised Representative of the respondents.

AWARD

The Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla vide its notification, dated the 4th August, 1989, referred the following dispute to this court for adjudication under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Hereinafter shortly referred to as the 'ACT') on failure of the conciliation proceedings between the parties:—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Ameresh Kumar, Conductor by the Management of H.R. T. C., Nahan is legal and maintainable? If illegal to what relief and amount of compensation, Shri Ameresh Kumar is entitled?”

2. The petitioner alleges that he was appointed as a conductor in the year, 1975 and his services were terminated in the year, 1977 without holding any enquiry in consonance with the principles of natural justice. No compliance of section 25 F of the Act was made by the respondents. Section 25 F of the Act has also been violated by the management as so many persons have been engaged and the petitioner was not given the opportunity. He prays for his re-instatement with all the consequential benefits.

3. The case of the respondent management is that the petitioner was appointed vide annexure R. 1 on month to month basis on 23-1-1975 Rs. 6/- per day. Since the petitioner was a casual labourer and according to terms of his employment his services could be terminated without any notice and requirement of section 25 F & H was not necessary to be complied with by the management. It is not a case of retrenchment according to the management under the provisions of the Act. From the pleadings the following issues were framed by me on 24-10-1991.—

1. Whether the petitioner has been terminated without justification and reasons? (O. P Parties).

2 Relief

FINDINGS ON ISSUES

Issue No. 1:

Mr. Gupta, representative of the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner had completed 240 days of continuous service with the respondent management as he was appointed on 23-1-1975 and his services were terminated without holding enquiry against him on 25-4-1977. Also the provisions of section 25 F and 25 H were not complied with by the respondent management.

5. Mr. Chouan, representative of the respondents submits that the petitioner had been discharged from service as his performance was not satisfactory. He further submits that the reference has been made after a prolonged period of 12 years after termination. I am of the view after pursuing the statement of P. W. 1 and R. W. 1 with the connected record that the petitioner was discharged from the service on 25-4-1977. The representation of the petitioner was rejected on 28-6-1977 (Page 7 of the document, R. W. 1/A). It is not clear as to when the petitioner took up his case with the Conciliation Officer. He has suppressed this fact for the reasons best known to him. He has also stated on oath regarding this fact. Generally, no limitation is applicable under the

Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for making a reference but there is a duty on every citizen including the worker to pursue the remedy with the Conciliation Officer if he was dissatisfied, with a reasonable time. He took up his case lapse of 10 or 12 years as the reference was made only in 1989, and he cannot be granted relief on the ground of laches. The worker cannot be allowed to dig up the old claim especially when his a post record regarding performance was not satisfactory and he was discharged on account of ticketless carriage of goods and passengers and the list of the cases is placed on record (Attached with R. W. 1/A). I am of the view that the petitioner has been rightly discharged from service by the respondent management taking into consideration the facts and surrounding circumstances of this case. It is not a case where the worker deserves to be granted relief. I, therefore, for the reasons recorded decide this issue against the petitioner and in favour of the respondent management.

RELIEF

6. In view of my findings on issue and reasons recorded, I pass an award accordingly in favour of the respondent management and against the petitioner. The petitioner is not entitled to any relief at this stage. Reference is answered accordingly in negative. Let a copy of this award be sent to the Government of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-2 for its due publication in the official gazette i.e. Himachal Pradesh Rajprta in accordance with law and a copy be given to the parties free of costs, if applied for by them. No orders as to the costs of these proceedings. The file after its due completion be consigned to the record room.

Announced on this 10th day of June, 1992, at Shimla.

R. K. MAHAJAN,

Presiding Officer,

Seal.

Labour Court, H. P. Shimla,

10-6-92.

बहुदेशीय परियोजनाएं एवं विद्युत विभाग

अधिसूचनाएं

शिमला-171 002, 30 अक्टूबर, 1992

संख्या विद्युत-ठ(5)-33/91.—यतः राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विजली बोर्ड जो कि भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 (1894 का पहला अधिनियम) को धारा 3 के खण्ड (सी) सी 0 के अर्थात् नगर सरकार के स्वामित्व और नियन्त्रण के अधीन एक निगम है के द्वारा अपने व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन नामतः ग्राम रुखड़ी, वनकला, शम्भूकला और मालेवाला तहसील सहित जिला सिरमौर में 132 के 0 बी 0 लाईन गिरी नगर से काला अम्ब तक के निर्माण हेतु भूमि अधिस्त करनी अत्यावश्यक अपेक्षित है अतएव एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिक्षेत्र में जैसा कि नीचे निम्नलिखित किया गया है, उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि अर्जन अपेक्षित है।

2. यह अधिसूचना ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों को, जो इसके सम्बन्धित हो सकते हैं, की जानकारी के लिए भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 4 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाती है।

3. पूर्वोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश इन समय इस उपक्रम में कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों, उनके कर्मचारियों तथा श्रमिकों को इलाके में किसी भी भूमि में प्रवेश करने तथा सर्वेक्षण करने और उस धारा द्वारा अपेक्षित अथवा अनुमतः अन्य सभी कार्यों को करने के लिए सहर्ष प्राधिकार देते हैं।

4. अत्याधिक आवश्यकता को ध्यान में रखते हुए, राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उप-धारा (4) के अधीन यह भी निर्देश देते हैं कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 5-ए के उपबन्ध इस मामले में लागू नहीं होंगे।

| विवरण | | | | |
|---------------|------------|-----------|-----------|--------|
| जिला : सिरमौर | तहसील | | नाहन | |
| ग्राम | टावर नम्बर | खसरा नं० | रकबा बीघा | बिस्वा |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| रुखरी | 53 | 122/43 | 0 | 1 |
| " | 53 | 44 | 0 | 2 |
| " | 54 | 157/24 | 0 | 4 |
| " | 55 | 23 | 0 | 4 |
| " | 56 | 184/20 | 0 | 2 |
| " | 57 | 12 मिन | 0 | 6 |
| बनकला | 58 | 104/41/1 | 0 | 2 |
| " | 59 | 204/41/2 | 0 | 4 |
| शम्भुवाला | 60 | 86 | 0 | 4 |
| शम्भुवाला | 62 | 64 | 0 | 2 |
| " | 63 | 168/58 | 0 | 2 |
| " | 64 | 25/1 | 0 | 4 |
| " | 65 | 25/2 | 0 | 2 |
| " | 66 | 124/13 | 0 | 2 |
| " | 67 | 12 | 0 | 4 |
| " | 68 | 150/6 मिन | 0 | 4 |
| मालावाला | 69 | 97 मिन | 0 | 4 |
| " | 70 | 117 मिन | 0 | 4 |
| कुल | 18 | | 2 | 17 |

शिमला-2, 30 दिसम्बर, 1992

संख्या : एम० पी० पी०-मो० (3) 26/88.—राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश, वर्ष 1991-92 की अवधि में हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड द्वारा राज्य सरकार को योजना श्रृंखला पर देय ब्याज की राशि जो 39,64,21,490.00 रुपये है, को बट्टे-खाते में डाले जाने की मध्य स्वीकृति प्रदान करने है।

इन राशि को बट्टे-खाते में डाले जाने के प्रादेश के दृष्टिगत हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को और हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड को प्राणीय विद्युतिकरण पूरे अनुदान के लिए कोई भी दायित्व नहीं

होगा और हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड प्राणीय विद्युतिकरण अनुदान के रूप में अपने लेखों में न तो कोई प्रावधान करेगा और न ही राज्य सरकार को और दायित्व दिखाएगा। यह स्वीकृति वित्त विभाग की सहमति के उपरान्त जारी की गई है जो कि अपने डायरी संख्या 2225-फिन०/आई०एफ०/92, दिनांक 22-8-1992 के अनुसार प्राप्त की गई है।

शुद्धि पत्र

शिमला-171002, 2 जनवरी, 1993

संख्या विद्युत (छ) 5-11/90.—इस विभाग की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना दिनांक 6 जून, 1992 के पृष्ठ-3 पर वर्णित ग्राम कांगू-1, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश पढ़कर नीचे दी गई शुद्धि की जाये :—

“खसरा नं० “17” रकबा तादादी 6-4-11 हैक्टरों के स्थान पर खसरा नं० 78 रकबा तादादी 6-4-11 पढ़ा जाये।

शिमला-171002, 2 जनवरी, 1993

संख्या विद्युत (छ) 5-9/90.—इस विभाग की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना दिनांक 6 जून, 1992 में वर्णित ग्राम मुहाल झाड़ण, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी में निम्न के अनुसार अधिसूचना में शुद्धि की जाये :—

1. खसरा नं० 257 का रकबा तादादी 1-17-7 हैक्टर के स्थान पर खसरा नं० 257 रकबा तादादी 1-11-7 हैक्टर पढ़ा जाय (अधिसूचना पृष्ठ-3)।

2. खसरा नं० 179 रकबा तादादी 0-2-9 हैक्टर के स्थान पर खसरा नं० 169 रकबा तादादी 0-2-9 पढ़ा जाय (अधिसूचना पृष्ठ 7)

आदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित/-
वित्तियुक्त एवं सचिव।

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-2, the 30th May, 1986

No. 1-49/69 PWD.Vol.VII.—In partial modification of this Department Notification of even number. dated 19-5-1986, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the transfers and postings of the following Assistant Engineers (Civil) in H.P., P.W.D., with immediate effect in the public interest :—

| Sl.No. | Name | From | To |
|--------|---------------------------|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1. | Sh. Y.P. Chaudhary | B&R Sub-Divn. Kamraur Kaffota | RID Nahan vice Sh. G.S. Ajmani. |
| 2. | Sh. G.S. Ajmani | RID Nahan | B&R Sub-Divn. Kamraur Kaffota vice Sh. Y. P. Chaudhary. |
| 3. | Sh. Ranjeet Singh | On Promotion under order of posting to B&R Sub-Divn. Katrain. | B&R Sub-Divn. Dharampur (Sarkaghat) vice Sh. B. S. Mandyal. |
| 4. | Sh. B. S. Mandyal | B&R Sub-Divn., Dharampur | B&R Sub-Divn. Katrain |
| 5. | Sh. Beas Dev | Under transfer from B&R Sub-Divn. Gharola to Dehra. | B&R Sub-Divn. No. II Nurpur |
| 6. | Sh. S.P. Kapoor | Shimla Sub-Divn. No. 9 under transfer to Nurpur Sub-Divn. 2. | E.O., 6th Circle, Kullu |
| 7. | Sh. N.K. Singh | Under transfer from Sub-Divn. No. 4 Shimla to E.O. 6th Circle, Kullu. | B&R Sub-Division Dehra |
| 8. | Sh. Promod Kumar | On promotion an under order of posting A.E.(D), Rampur Circle. | A.E.(D) IPH Shahnehar against a vacant post. |
| 9. | Sh. Sudarshan Bir Thakur | B&R Sub-Divn. Tindi | A.E.(D) IPH Sundernagar against vacant post. |
| 10. | Sh. Jai Pal Singh Chauhan | B&R Sub-Divn. Pooh. | B&R Sub-Divn., No. 1 Solan against a vacant post. |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|-----|---------------------------|--|---|
| 11. | Sh. Ashwani Kumar Gupta | IPH Shahzhar Divn. Sansarpur Terrace | IPH Sub-Divn., Shahpur <i>against</i> vacant post. |
| 12. | Sh. Thakur Dass | B&R Sub-Divn. Shamshi (Kullu). | B&R Sub-Divn. Sarkaghat |
| 13. | Sh. P. C. Palia | B&R Sub-Divn. Sarkaghat | B&R Sub-Divn. Shamshi (Kullu) |
| 14. | Sh. R. K. Garg | Under transfer to IPH Sub-Divn. No. II, Rampur. | A.E.(D) IPH Circle Nahan, <i>aga-</i> <i>inst</i> vacant post. |
| 15. | Sh. R. C. Verma | Under Transfer to B&R Sub-Divn., Shahpur. | A.E.(D) Hqrs. Shimla <i>against</i> vacant post. |
| 16. | Sh. Bahadur Singh Chauhan | B&R Sub-Divn. Tikkar | B&R Sub-Divn. Karchhan <i>in-</i> <i>stead</i> of Sh. M. K. Gupta. |
| 17. | Sh. Mohinder Kumar Gupta | On promotion & under order of post at Kachham. | B&R Sub-Divn., Tikkar |
| 18. | Sh. Parvez Akhtar | IPH Sub-Divn. Sundernagar under IPH Divn. Sundernagar. | A.E.(D) IPH Head office Shimla <i>vice</i> Sh. G.S. Guleria. |
| 19. | Sh. I. C. Malhotra | IPH Sub-Divn., Katrain under IPH Divn. Kullu. | IPH Sub-Divn. Jawali under IPH Divn., Nurpur. |
| 20. | Sh. S.C. Gupta | IPH Sub-Divn., Jawali under IPH Divn., Nurpur. | IPH Sub-Divn. Sundernagar <i>vice</i> Sh. Parvez Akhtar. |
| 21. | Sh. G.S. Guleria | A.E.(D)Hqrs., Shimla | Surface W.Org. Solan <i>against</i> vacant post |
| 22. | Sh. D.N. Malhotra | On promotion and under order of post- ing at Shillai. | B&R Sub-Divn. Dhawla Kuan |

The transfer orders of Shri K. C. Aggarwal A.E. from Shillai to Dhawla Kuan are hereby cancelled.

All the above officers except Sh. Bahadur Singh Chauhan are entitled to usual joining time and TTA as admis-
sible under the rules.

The transfer of Shri Bahadur Singh Chauhan being on request is without TT.A.

Shimla-2, the 10th June, 1986

No. 1-98/70-PWA-Vol. IV.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the transfer and posting of the
following Superintending Engineers in Public Works Department in public interest with immediate effect :—

| Sl.No. | Name | From | To |
|--------|-------------------|--|---|
| 1. | Sh. S. P. Punhani | S. E. IV Circle, Shimla | H. P. Housing Board on deputa- tion. |
| 2. | Sh. S. K. Vaidya | S. E. (Design-III) Head Office, Shimla | S. E. IV Circle, Shimla <i>vice</i> Sh. Punhani transferred. |

2. The order containing terms and conditions of deputation of Sh. S.P. Punhani will be issued separately.

3. The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is further pleased to order that Sh. S. K. Vaidya shall continue to hold the
post of S.E.(Design-III) Head office Shimla in addition to the charge of the post of S. E. IV. Circle, Shimla
till further orders.

Shimla-2, the 11th June, 1986

No. 1-43/75-PWA-Vol.VI.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the following transfers and post-
ings of Executive Engineers of the Public Works Department in the public interest with immediate effect:—

| Sl.No. | Name | From | To |
|--------|-----------------|--|---|
| 1. | Shri H.S.Bist | Municipal Corporation, Shimla | Executive Engineer (D) Head- quarters, <i>vice</i> Shri G.S.Bajwa. |
| 2. | Shri G.S. Bajwa | Executive Engineer (D), Headquarters, Shimla. | Municipal Corporation, Shimla on deputation. |

The order containing terms and conditions of deputation of Shri G. S. Bajwa will be issued separately.

Shimla-2, the 12th June, 1986

No. 1-49/69-PWD-VII.—In partial modification of this Department notifications of even number dated 19th May, 1986 and 30th May, 1986, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the transfer and posting of the following Assistant Engineer (Civil) in H.P., P.W.D./I&PH with immediate effect in public interest :—

| Sl.No. | Name | From | To |
|--------|----------------------|--|---|
| S/Shri | | | |
| 1. | V.K.Malhotra | B&R Sub-Division Banikhet | E.O. 9th Circle, Nurpur <i>against</i> vacant post. |
| 2. | Surinder Kumar | On promotion under orders of posting in B&R Sub-Division Udaipur. | B&R Sub-Division Banikhet <i>vice</i> Shri V. K. Malhotra transferred. |
| 3. | Jai Karan | On promotion under orders of posting in B&R Sub-Division Durgatti | B&R Sub-Division Udaipur |
| 4. | Lalit Bhushan | on fresh appointment | B&R Sub-Division Garola <i>against</i> vacant post. |
| 5. | Bhola Ram | IPH Sub-Division No.1 Kasumpti | IPH Sub-Division No. 1 Jubbal, <i>vice</i> Sh. S.D. Kalsi. |
| 6. | D. S. Kalsi | IPH Sub-Division No. I Jubbal | SDA Shimla on deputation |
| 7. | Satya Vrat Sharma | On fresh appointment | IPH Sub-Division No.1 Kasumpti <i>vice</i> Sh. Bhola Ram. |
| 8. | T.P.Bhatnagar | Under orders of transfer from IPH Sub-Division Keylong to IPH Sub-Division Salooni. | IPH Sub-Division Katrain <i>vice</i> Sh. I.C. Malhotra. |
| 9. | Kehar Singh Thakur | On fresh appointment | B & R Sub-Division Shahpur <i>against</i> vacant post. |
| 10. | Naresh Kumar Kapila | On fresh appointment | B&R Sub-Division Tindi <i>against</i> vacant post. |
| 11. | Bidhi Chand | AR(D)E-in-C's Office | B&R Sub Division Sarkaghat. |
| 12. | Thakur Dass | Under orders of transfer to B&R Sub-Division Sarkaghat. | B&R Sub-Division Dharampur <i>vice</i> Sh. Satish Kumar Vatsa. |
| 13. | Satish Kumar Vatsa | B&R Sub-Division Dharampur | AE(D) Hqtrs. <i>vice</i> Shri Bidhi Chand. |
| 14. | G. D. Wadhera | Under orders of transfer from Nadaun to IPH Sub-Division Dharampur. | IPH Sub-Division Chopal instead of Sh. Prem Dass. |
| 15. | R. K. Jain | Under order of transfer to B&R Sub-Division No. III Shimla. | B&R Sub-Division No.IV <i>instead</i> of Sh. Sham Lal. |
| 16. | Sham Lal | Under orders of transfer to B&R Sub-Division No. IV Shimla | B&R Sub-Division No.III <i>instead</i> of Sh.R.K.Jain. |
| 17. | O. P. Thakur | Under orders of transfer on promotion to AE(D) IPH Circle Hamirpur. | AE IPH Sub-Division No. II Rampur <i>instead</i> of Shri R.K.Garg already transferred to Nahan. |
| 18. | Sita Ram | Under orders of transfer from store Sub-Divn. Sanjauli to B&R Sub-Division Parwanoo. | B&R Sub-Divn. Thanedhar. |
| 19. | R. S. Kanwar | AE B&R, Hamirpur | AE(D) 2nd Circle Shimla |
| 20. | Bhawan Kumar Sharma | On fresh appointment | AE (D) 2nd Circle Shimla |
| 21. | Navin Puri | On fresh appointment | AE (D) IPH Circle, Hamirpur |
| 22. | Naresh Kumar Vashist | On fresh appointment | AE (D) Hqrs. (P.W.D.) Shimla. |
| 23. | Lekh Ram Chaudhry | On fresh appointment | Shahnehar Project Sub-Division No.1 Sansarpur Terrace <i>vice</i> Sh.A.K.Gupta transferred. |
| 24. | K. K. Gupta | Under order of transfer from Sabathu Sub-Division to AE (D) Hqtrs. Shimla | AE(D) B&R, Nahan |
| 25. | B. N. Arora | Under transfer to IPH Sub. Division Fatehpur. | Giri IPH Sub-Division Majra |
| 26. | B. S. Bhardwaj | Under transfer from B&R Sub-Division Nirmand to Nainadevi | AE (B&R) Kotkhai <i>vice</i> Sh. Ashwani Kumar. |
| 27. | Ashwani Kumar | AE, Kotkhai Sub-Division | AE (Dev.) Kalpa. |
| 28. | C. C. Vergese | On promotion under order of posting at Kalpa as AE (Dev). | AR (B&R), Rampur. |
| 29. | V. T. Negi | AE, Rampur. | AE B&R Sub-Division Jubbal <i>vice</i> Sh. S. S. Dass Vaish. |
| 30. | S. S. Dass Vaish | AE B&R, Jubbal | AE, B&R, Nainadevi |
| 31. | Bir Singh Mastana | On promotion under order of posting in IPH Sub-Division Jhandutta. | IPH Sub-Division Kalol <i>vice</i> Sh. K.C.Dhiman. |
| 32. | K. C. Dhiman | IPH Sub-Division, Kalol. | IPH Sub-Division Jhandutta |

The transfer and posting orders of S/Shri Prem Dass, R.S. Chaudhry, A.N Sharma and Bhag Singh already issued *vide* notification of even number dated 19-5-86 are hereby cancelled.

The posting order in respect of Shri O. P. Sharma under orders of transfer from Dehra to Garola are being issued separately.

All the above officers except fresh appointees are entitled to joining time and T.T.A.

Shimla-2, the 13th June, 1986

No. 1-49/69-PWD.Vol.VII.—The Governor Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order the transfers and postings of the following Assistant Engineers (Civil) in H.P., P.W.D. with immediate effect in the public interest:—

| Sl.No. | Name | From | To |
|--------|--------------------------|--|---|
| 1. | Shri Durga Singh Chandel | Under orders of posting on promotion to Kullu B&R Sub Division | B&R Sub-Division No.II Ghumarwin Shri M.D.Sahni. |
| 2. | Shri M.D. Sahni | B&R Sub Div. No. II Ghumarwin | B&R Sub-Division Kullu. |

Shimla-2, the 16th June, 1986

No. 1-49/69-PWD-VII.—In partial modification of this Department notification of even number dated 12th June, 1986, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the transfer and posting of the following Assistant Engineers (Civil) in H.P., P.W.D./I&PH with immediate effect in public interest:—

| Sl. No. | Name | From | To |
|---------|---------------------------|--|---|
| 1. | S/Shri. Satya Vrat Sharma | On fresh appointment under order of posting in IPH Sub-Division No. 1, Kasumpti. | AE (D)B&R Hqrs. Shimla vice Sh. Satish Vatsa. |
| 2. | Satish Kumar Vatsa | Under order of transfer as AE Hqrs. (B&R) (Design) Shimla. | AE IPH Sub-Division No.1 Jubbal instead of Sh. Bhola Ram. |

The transfer order of Shri Bhola Ram, AE from IPH Sub-Division No.1, Kasumpti to IPH Sub-Division No.1 Jubbal issued vide notification of even number dated the 12th June, 1986 are hereby cancelled.

B.B.TANDON,
Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

शिमला-171002; 19 दिसम्बर, 1992

अर्जन समाहर्ता (1), लोक निर्माण विभाग, शिमला-2 के समक्ष अपनी आपत्ति दायर कर सकता है।

विवरण

| जिला : शिमला | | तहसील : कुमारसेन | |
|--------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------|
| गांव | खसरा नं० | क्षेत्र | बीघा विस्वा |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| किरटी | 596/597/532 मिन | 3 | 3 |
| | 496/597/532 मिन | 0 | 5 |
| | 89/557/370 | 4 | 17 |
| | 661/371 मिन | 2 | 15 |
| | 661/371 मिन | 2 | 15 |
| | 662/371 मिन | 5 | 17 |
| | 758/385 | 1 | 0 |
| | 627/383 | 2 | 19 |
| | 628/383 | 1 | 16 |
| | 384 | 1 | 4 |
| | 353 | 0 | 13 |
| | 809/734/707/792/530 | 5 | 3 |
| | 831/810/734/530 | 0 | 18 |
| | 781/707/530 | 0 | 8 |
| | 780/707/530 | 0 | 11 |
| 538 | 538 | 1 | 5 |
| | 766/703/541 | 2 | 14 |
| | 540 | 2 | 14 |
| | 539 | 4 | 3 |
| 765/703/541 | 765/703/541 | 3 | 0 |

संख्या लो० नि० (ख०) 7(1)49/90.—यत् भारत के राष्ट्रपति को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को अपने व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः गांव किरटी, दलान, मानन, भनाना और खुन्दी चिमला, तहसील कुमारसेन, जिला शिमला में नौग किरटी-दलान सड़क के निर्माण हेतु भूमि अर्जित करने अपेक्षित है, अतएव एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिक्षेत्र में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणी में निर्दिष्ट किया गया है, उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का अर्जन अपेक्षित है।

2. यह अधिसूचना ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों को, जो इनके सम्बन्धित हो सकते हैं को जानकारी के लिए भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 4 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाती है।

3. पूर्वोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, राष्ट्रपति इस समय इस उपक्रम में कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों, उनके कर्मचारियों और श्रमिकों को इलाके की किसी भी भूमि में प्रवेश करने और सर्वेक्षण करने तथा उस धारा द्वारा अपेक्षित या अनुमत अन्य सभी कार्यों को करने के लिए सहर्ष प्राधिकार देते हैं।

4. कोई भी हितवद्ध व्यक्ति जिसे उक्त परिक्षेत्र में कथित भूमि के अर्जन पर कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशित होने के 30 (तीस) दिन की अवधि के भीतर लिखित रूप में भू-

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---------|-----------------|-----|----|---------|-------------|-----|-------|
| | 83/703/541 | 2 | 11 | | 363 | 0 | 13 |
| | 879/547/532 | 2 | 0 | | 1038/516 | 4 | 0 |
| | 772/595/532 | 3 | 0 | | 817/364 | 0 | 15 |
| | 802/757/370 | 11 | 12 | | 818/364 | 0 | 18 |
| | 832/810/754/530 | 5 | 4 | | 978/388 | 0 | 14 |
| | 711/641/593/530 | 4 | 17 | | | | |
| | 775/595/547/532 | 1 | 8 | | किता .. | 60 | 379 2 |
| | 838/794/541 | 177 | 14 | | | | |
| | 522 | 17 | 12 | मानन | 158 | 6 | 0 |
| | 522 | 3 | 1 | | 160 मिन | 2 | 10 |
| | | | | | 160 मिन | 4 | 8 |
| किता .. | 30 | 274 | 11 | | 161 | 1 | 2 |
| | | | | | 295/276/211 | 2 | 3 |
| दलान | 340 | 0 | 17 | | 297/276/211 | 5 | 17 |
| | 341 | 4 | 8 | | 291/273/157 | 6 | 14 |
| | 342 | 2 | 4 | | 296/276/211 | 5 | 0 |
| | 346 | 0 | 8 | | 156 | 255 | 5 |
| | 347 | 4 | 7 | | 292/273/157 | 72 | 4 |
| | 757/337 | 2 | 5 | | 294/276/211 | 154 | 18 |
| | 649/470 | 0 | 5 | | 279/212 | 53 | 1 |
| | 660/470 | 0 | 5 | | 32 | 1 | 0 |
| | 351 | 0 | 3 | | | | |
| | 698/352 | 3 | 3 | किता .. | 13 | 570 | 12 |
| | 699/352 | 4 | 5 | | | | |
| | 344 | 11 | 16 | भनना | 212/204/143 | 2 | 8 |
| | 345 | 0 | 5 | | 213/204/143 | 5 | 3 |
| | 349 | 0 | 8 | | 203/137/143 | 8 | 3 |
| | 350 | 2 | 3 | | 209/204/143 | 6 | 8 |
| | 343 | 1 | 9 | | 214/204/143 | 4 | 3 |
| | 342 | 4 | 1 | | 111 मिन | 1 | 1 |
| | 015 | 4 | 8 | | 123 " | 1 | 5 |
| | 338 | 0 | 12 | | 140 " | 0 | 13 |
| | 760/362 | 1 | 9 | | 136 " | 1 | 13 |
| | 772/362 | 1 | 8 | | 111 " | 1 | 1 |
| | 758/337 | 2 | 6 | | 120 " | 1 | 0 |
| | 336 | 3 | 12 | | 123 " | 1 | 5 |
| | 339 | 0 | 6 | | 140 " | 0 | 14 |
| | 656/394 | 2 | 14 | | 142 " | 1 | 9 |
| | 380 | 1 | 7 | | 157 " | 2 | 14 |
| | 390 | 1 | 0 | | 111 " | 1 | 1 |
| | 1060/842/412 | 3 | 1 | | 123 " | 1 | 5 |
| | 1061/842/412 | 1 | 19 | | 134 " | 2 | 3 |
| | 843/412 | 2 | 14 | | 142 " | 1 | 9 |
| | 853/469 | 1 | 10 | | 111 " | 1 | 1 |
| | 866/614 | 1 | 10 | | 123 " | 1 | 6 |
| | 852/469 | 2 | 0 | | 134 " | 2 | 2 |
| | 865/614 | 1 | 0 | | 140 " | 0 | 13 |
| | 471 | 1 | 12 | | 218/211/143 | 7 | 5 |
| | 658/470 | 2 | 7 | | 122 मिन | 0 | 17 |
| | 661/470 | 0 | 4 | | 122 " | 0 | 16 |
| | 367 | 0 | 6 | | 122 " | 0 | 16 |
| | 386 | 4 | 1 | | 171/125 मिन | 0 | 9 |
| | 979/388 | 2 | 9 | | 172/125 | 0 | 11 |
| | 851/469 | 3 | 17 | | 124 | 0 | 18 |
| | 864/614 | 0 | 3 | | 107 | 1 | 14 |
| | 1095/854/469 | 9 | 12 | | 108 | 11 | 13 |
| | 1046/854/469 | 11 | 10 | | 127 | 1 | 9 |
| | 1047/854/469 | 3 | 14 | | 137 | 0 | 16 |
| | 1048/854/469 | 2 | 19 | | 135 | 2 | 12 |
| | 360 | 2 | 14 | | 138 | 0 | 13 |
| | 366 | 2 | 16 | | 139 | 0 | 3 |
| | 389 | 1 | 0 | | 110 | 3 | 1 |
| | 848/412 | 9 | 15 | | 141 | 1 | 4 |
| | 1049/854/469 | 212 | 0 | | 159 | 1 | 19 |
| | 610 | 8 | 4 | | 207/186/143 | 2 | 0 |
| | 868/614 | 16 | 5 | | 210/204/143 | 9 | 12 |
| | 937/179 | 0 | 13 | | 62 | 1 | 13 |
| | 938/172 | 0 | 12 | | 207/202/39 | 3 | 1 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3. भूमि का रेखांक, भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता, लोक निर्माण विभाग, कांगड़ा के कार्यालय में निरीक्षण किया जा सकता है। |
|---|----------------|----|----|--|
| | 231/208/39 | 6 | 13 | |
| | 193/39 | 4 | 14 | |
| | 195/39 | 2 | 0 | |
| | 235/232/208/39 | 57 | 5 | |
| | 63 | 2 | 13 | |
| | 64 | 3 | 4 | |
| | 112 | 2 | 10 | |
| | 222/211/143 | 78 | 15 | |

| किता .. | 52 | 259 | 16 |
|-------------|----------------|-----|----|
| स्कूल निमला | 102 | 0 | 11 |
| | 103 | 0 | 15 |
| | 104 | 2 | 1 |
| | 105 | 0 | 12 |
| | 106 | 0 | 9 |
| | 103 | 1 | 1 |
| | 113 | 0 | 8 |
| | 530/109 | 0 | 9 |
| | 531/109 | 1 | 6 |
| | 35 | 1 | 1 |
| | 306 | 1 | 6 |
| | 101 | 2 | 2 |
| | 107 | 0 | 17 |
| | 307 | 0 | 17 |
| | 577/358/353/28 | 161 | 3 |
| | 36 | 0 | 5 |
| | 99 | 2 | 6 |
| | 546/127 | 31 | 13 |
| | 561/537/305 | 122 | 4 |
| | 239 | 3 | 14 |
| | 34 | 4 | 1 |
| | 542/149 | 2 | 2 |

किता .. 22 341 3

शिमला-2, 30 दिसम्बर, 1992

संख्या पी0 बी0 डब्ल्यू0 2 बी(3)-35/91.—भारत के राष्ट्रपति, श्री दयानन्द शर्मा, अधीक्षक ग्रेड-I (राजपत्रित वर्ग-II), कार्यालय मुख्य अभियन्ता (दक्षिण), हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक निर्माण विभाग, शिमला को उनकी अधिवर्षिता की आयु प्राप्त करने पर सरकारी सेवा से दिनांक 31-12-1992 (अपराह्न) से सेवा निवृत्त करने के सहर्ष आदेश देते हैं।

शिमला-2, 30 दिसम्बर, 1992

संख्या लो0 नि0 (ख) 7(1) 42/92.—यतः भारत के राष्ट्रपति को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यवसाय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः गांव धूरकड़ी चौक, तहसील बूँव जिला कांगड़ा में बालन्धर-होशियारपुर सड़क के निर्माण हेतु भूमि ली जानी अपेक्षित है, अतएव एतद्वारा यह घोषित किया जाता है कि नीचे विवरणी में वर्णित भूमि उपयुक्त प्रयोजन के लिए अपेक्षित है।

2. यह घोषणा भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 6 के उपबन्धों के अधीन इससे सम्बन्धित सभी व्यक्तियों की सूचना हेतु की जाती है तथा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता, लोक निर्माण विभाग, कांगड़ा को उक्त भूमि के अर्जन करने के आदेश लेने का एतद्वारा निदेश दिया जाता है।

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-------------|-----------------|---|----|----|
| धूरकड़ी चौक | 192 | 0 | 00 | 98 |
| | 193 | 0 | 00 | 14 |
| | 194 | 0 | 00 | 18 |
| | 195/1 | 0 | 01 | 84 |
| | 1092/1059/196/1 | 0 | 00 | 14 |
| | 1093/1059/196/1 | 0 | 00 | 10 |
| | 1097/197/1 | 0 | 00 | 22 |
| | 1099/197/1 | 0 | 00 | 20 |
| | 1096/197/1 | 0 | 00 | 24 |
| | 198/1 | 0 | 00 | 18 |
| | 1103/199/1 | 0 | 00 | 32 |
| | 1104/199/1 | 0 | 00 | 56 |
| | 243/1 | 0 | 00 | 94 |
| | 244/1 | 0 | 00 | 16 |
| | 245/1 | 0 | 00 | 41 |

किता .. 15 0 05 71

शिमला-171002, 30 दिसम्बर, 1992

संख्या: लो0 नि0 (ख0) 7(1) 199/91.—यतः भारत के राष्ट्रपति को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यवसाय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः गांव खलीनी और बिहार, तहसील बूँव जिला शिमला में खलीनी-बिहार सड़क के निर्माण हेतु भूमि ली जानी अपेक्षित है, अतएव एतद्वारा यह घोषित किया जाता है कि नीचे विवरणी में वर्णित भूमि उपयुक्त प्रयोजन के लिए अपेक्षित है।

2. यह घोषणा भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा-6 के उपबन्धों के अधीन इससे सम्बन्धित सभी व्यक्तियों की सूचना हेतु की जाती है तथा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा-7 के अधीन भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता (2), लोक निर्माण विभाग, शिमला-3 को उक्त भूमि के अर्जन करने के लिए आदेश लेने का एतद्वारा निदेश दिया जाता है।

3. भूमि का रेखांक, भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता (2), लोक निर्माण विभाग, शिमला-3 के कार्यालय में निरीक्षण किया जा सकता है।

विवरणी

| जिला: शिमला | | तहसील: शिमला | |
|-------------|-------------|--------------|-----|
| गांव | खसरा संख्या | अंश | बि० |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| खलीनी | 74/1 | 0 | 3 |
| | 75/1 | 0 | 1 |
| | 142/1 | 0 | 5 |
| किता .. | 3 | 0 | 9 |
| बिहार | 596/1 | 0 | 1 |
| | 603/1 | 0 | 2 |
| किता .. | 2 | 0 | 3 |

शुद्धि पत्र/अनुशेष

में भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता, लोक निर्माण विभाग, चम्बा के समक्ष अपनी आपत्ति दायर कर सकता है।

शिमला-171002, 30 दिसम्बर, 1992

संख्या लो0 नि0 (ख) (7) 259/91.—इस विभाग द्वारा जारी समसंख्यक अधिसूचना दिनांक 20 मई, 1992 तथा शुद्धि पत्र/अनुशेष दिनांक 26 सितम्बर, 1992 जो कि बानीपुल मशराह-थरोच सड़क के निर्माण हेतु भू-अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 6-7 के अधीन जारी की गई है, गांव थरोच में इस प्रकार से शुद्धि पत्र/अनुशेष जारी किया जाता है—

खसरा नं० क्षेत्र जो अब पड़ा जाए

1242/624/1 नये सिरे से जोड़ा जाता है 0-6

1242/624/2 -यथोपरि- 0-1

2/1 रकबा 0-7 को अर्जित करने से छोड़ दिया जाता है किता 52 के स्थान पर किता 53 पड़ा जाये।

शुद्धि पत्र

शिमला-2, 30 दिसम्बर, 1992

संख्या लो0 नि0 (ख) 7 (1) 93/91.—इस विभाग की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना दिनांक 20-10-92 जो कि तताहड-चन्द्रखड़ी सड़क के निर्माण हेतु गांव ततहार, तहसील सरकाघाट, जिला मण्डी में भू-अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा-6 व 7 के अन्तर्गत जारी की गई थी में खसरा नम्बर 404/1 के स्थान पर 400/1, 398/1 के स्थान पर 399/1 व 157/1 के स्थान पर 151/1 पड़ा जाये।

इसके अतिरिक्त 134/1 का रकबा 0-00-22 हेक्टेयर के स्थान पर 0-00-34 हेक्टेयर पड़ा जाए तथा खसरा नम्बर 174/1 रकबा 0-00-06 हेक्टेयर अधिसूचना से काट दिया जाये।

अधिसूचनाएं

शिमला-2, 1 जनवरी, 1993

संख्या लो0 नि0 (ख) 7 (1) 109/92.—यतः भारत के राष्ट्रपति की यह प्रतीति है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः गांव बिना 276, तहसील मटिया, जिला चम्बा में समोड-खतोड-बिना सड़क के निर्माण हेतु भूमि अर्जन करने की अपेक्षित है, अतएव एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचना जारी की जाती है कि उक्त परिक्षेत्र में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणी में निदिष्ट किया गया है, उर्रोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का अर्जन अपेक्षित है।

2. यह अधिसूचना तम सभी व्यक्तियों को, जो इससे सम्बन्धित हो सकते हैं, की जानकारी के लिये भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 4 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाती है।

3. पूर्वोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारत के राष्ट्रपति, इस समय इस उपक्रम में कार्यरत सभी अधिवासियों, उनके कर्मचारियों और श्रमिकों को इलाके की किसी भी भूमि में प्रवेश करने और सर्वेक्षण करने तथा उन द्वारा अर्पणित या अनुमत अन्य सभी कार्यों को करने के लिये महत्व प्राधिकार देते हैं।

4. कोई भी हितवद्ध व्यक्ति जिसे उक्त परिक्षेत्र में कथित भूमि के अर्जन पर कोई आपत्ति हो ता वह इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन होने के तीस (30) दिनों की अवधि के भीतर लिखित रूप

विवरणी

जिला : चम्बा

तहसील : मटिया

| सं० | खसरा नं० | क्षेत्र | बीघा | विवरणा |
|------|-------------|---------|------|--------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| बिना | 1018/1 | 0 | 02 | |
| 276. | 1019/1 | 0 | 02 | |
| | 1094/1021/1 | 0 | 15 | |
| | 1049/1 | 0 | 03 | |
| | 1052/1 | 0 | 04 | |
| | 1053/1 | 0 | 03 | |
| | 1082/1 | 0 | 02 | |
| | 1083/1 | 0 | 11 | |
| | 1083/2 | 0 | 03 | |
| | 1090/1 | 0 | 01 | |
| | 1091/1 | 0 | 04 | |
| | 1093 | 0 | 04 | |
| | 1094 | 0 | 03 | |
| किता | 13 | 2 | 17 | |

यतः भारत के राष्ट्रपति को यह प्रतीति होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु भूमि ली जानी अपेक्षित है, अतएव एतद्वारा यह घोषित किया जाता है कि नीचे विवरणी में वर्णित भूमि उपर्युक्त प्रयोजन के लिए अपेक्षित है।

2. यह घोषणा भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा-6 के उपबन्धों के अधीन इससे सम्बन्धित सभी व्यक्तियों की सूचना हेतु की जाती है तथा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा-7 के उपबन्धों के अधीन भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता, लोक निर्माण विभाग, मण्डी को उक्त भूमि के अर्जन करने के आदेश देने का एतद्वारा निदेश दिया जाता है।

3. भूमि का रेखांक भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता, लोक निर्माण विभाग, मण्डी के कार्यालय में निरीक्षण किया जा सकता है।

*गांव मास्वर, तहसील सदर, जिला मण्डी में राष्ट्रीय उच्च मार्ग-21 के निर्माण हेतु।

संख्या लो0 नि0 (ख) 7 (1) 110/91.

शिमला-2, 1 जनवरी, 1993.

विवरणी

जिला : मण्डी

तहसील : सदर

| सं० | खसरा नं० | क्षेत्र | बीघा | विवरणा |
|--------|----------|---------|------|--------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| मास्वर | 409/90/2 | 0 | 05 | 13 |
| | 363/92 | 0 | 19 | 08 |
| | 364/92/1 | 0 | 08 | 10 |
| किता | 3 | 1 | 13 | 11 |

तहसील : करसोग

गांव बादर, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी में केलोधार-सेज सड़क के निर्माण हेतु।

संख्या : लो0 नि0 (ख) 7 (1) 72/92

शिमला-2, 1 जनवरी, 1993.

| | | | | |
|----------|---------|---|----|---|
| बादर/571 | 521/1 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| | 508 सा0 | 0 | 17 | 2 |
| | 507/1 | 0 | 1 | 6 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-----------|-----------|---|----|----|---|------------|---|----|----|
| | 493/1 | 0 | 14 | 10 | | 127 | 0 | 28 | 22 |
| | 557/1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | | 130/1 | 0 | 16 | 34 |
| | 543/1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | | 133 | 0 | 21 | 67 |
| | 558/1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | | 875/134/1 | 0 | 29 | 55 |
| | 695/1 | 0 | 1 | 17 | | 679/1 | 0 | 17 | 68 |
| | 717/ सा 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | | 381/1 | 0 | 00 | 26 |
| | 716 सा 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | | 382 | 0 | 02 | 65 |
| | 715 सा 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | | 383 | 0 | 00 | 30 |
| | 711/1 | 0 | 1 | 11 | | 677/1 | 0 | 04 | 32 |
| | 713/1 | 0 | 7 | 14 | | 678 | 0 | 16 | 27 |
| | 733/1/1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | | 683/1 | 0 | 02 | 60 |
| | 734/1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | 685/1 | 0 | 02 | 80 |
| | 728/1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | | 688/1 | 0 | 00 | 50 |
| | 733/1 | 0 | 6 | 12 | | 622/1 | 0 | 00 | 24 |
| | 727/1 | 0 | 1 | 12 | | 626/1 | 0 | 00 | 72 |
| | 729/1 | 0 | 14 | 9 | | 682/1 | 0 | 15 | 85 |
| कित्ता .. | 19 | 5 | 15 | 0 | | 682/2 | 0 | 45 | 50 |
| | | | | | | 689 | 0 | 35 | 87 |
| | | | | | | 864/1 | 0 | 08 | 57 |
| | | | | | | 859/1 | 0 | 18 | 40 |
| | | | | | | 859/2 | 0 | 22 | 93 |
| | | | | | | 873/69 3/1 | 0 | 03 | 48 |

जिमला-2, 1 जनवरी, 1993

संख्या लो० नि० (घ) 7(1) 183/91.—यतः भारत के राष्ट्रपति को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामतः गांव गुभर, रुम्बल, भरच लाहड़ व मनेई, तहसील हारचकियां, जिला कांगड़ा में रानीताल-कोटला सड़क कि० मी० 18/0 से 25/08 के निर्माण हेतु भूमि अर्जित करनी अपेक्षित है। अनुरूप एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिसर में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणों में निर्दिष्ट किया गया है, उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का अर्जन अपेक्षित है।

2. यह अधिसूचना ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों को, जो इससे सम्बन्धित हो सकते हैं, की जानकारी के लिए भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम, 1894 की धारा 4 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाती है।

3. पूर्वोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत के राष्ट्रपति इस समय इस उपक्रम में कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों, उनके कर्मचारियों और श्रमिकों को इलाके की किसी भी भूमि में प्रवेश करने और सर्वेक्षण करने तथा उम धारा द्वारा अपेक्षित या अनुमत अन्य सभी कार्यों को करने के लिए सहर्ष प्राधिकार देते हैं।

4. कोई भी हितवद्ध व्यक्ति जिसे उक्त परिश्रम में कथित भूमि के अर्जन पर कोई आपत्ति हो, तो वह इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन होने के तीस (30) दिन की अवधि के भीतर लिखित रूप में भू-प्रार्जन समाहर्ता, लोक निर्माण विभाग, कांगड़ा के समक्ष अपनी आपत्ति दायर कर सकता है।

विवरणी

जिला: कांगड़ा तहसील: हारचकियां

| गांव | खसरा नं० | क्षेत्र | हेक्टेयरों में |
|------|----------|---------|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| गुभर | 105/1 | 0 | 00 14 |
| | 106/1 | 0 | 00 16 |
| | 107/1 | 0 | 00 24 |
| | 115 | 0 | 02 27 |
| | 117/1 | 0 | 01 47 |
| | 118/1 | 0 | 00 11 |
| | 119 | 0 | 00 71 |
| | 120 | 0 | 07 56 |
| | 121/1 | 0 | 04 20 |
| | 128/1 | 0 | 01 92 |
| | 126/1 | 0 | 05 75 |

कित्ता .. 33 3 19 45

रुम्बल

| | | | |
|-------|---|----|----|
| 613/1 | 0 | 30 | 28 |
| 613/3 | 0 | 03 | 57 |
| 616/1 | 0 | 00 | 46 |
| 617/1 | 0 | 06 | 90 |
| 617/2 | 0 | 22 | 80 |
| 618 | 0 | 22 | 13 |
| 619/1 | 0 | 04 | 59 |
| 619/3 | 0 | 04 | 22 |
| 626/1 | 0 | 01 | 24 |

कित्ता .. 9 0 96 89

भरच लाहड़

| | | | |
|-------|---|----|----|
| 24/1 | 0 | 01 | 98 |
| 26/1 | 0 | 05 | 09 |
| 30/1 | 0 | 01 | 45 |
| 33/1 | 0 | 07 | 59 |
| 627/1 | 0 | 01 | 05 |
| 627/2 | 0 | 36 | 05 |
| 43/1 | 0 | 01 | 87 |
| 28 | 0 | 02 | 24 |
| 29 | 0 | 01 | 06 |
| 31 | 0 | 00 | 41 |

कित्ता .. 10 0 58 79

मनेई

| | | | |
|-------|---|----|----|
| 1/1 | 0 | 00 | 90 |
| 118/1 | 0 | 02 | 70 |
| 119/1 | 0 | 00 | 08 |
| 120/1 | 0 | 00 | 22 |
| 121/1 | 0 | 00 | 18 |
| 122/1 | 0 | 00 | 26 |
| 129/1 | 0 | 04 | 59 |
| 130/1 | 0 | 01 | 66 |
| 131 | 0 | 00 | 51 |
| 132/1 | 0 | 00 | 42 |
| 133/1 | 0 | 00 | 16 |
| 137/1 | 0 | 02 | 30 |
| 138/1 | 0 | 01 | 38 |
| 139/1 | 0 | 01 | 77 |
| 143/1 | 0 | 00 | 99 |
| 168 | 0 | 04 | 65 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---------|-------|---|----|----|
| | 169 | 0 | 00 | 38 |
| | 167/1 | 0 | 00 | 21 |
| | 170 | 0 | 13 | 56 |
| | 172/1 | 0 | 04 | 45 |
| | 173/1 | 0 | 00 | 36 |
| | 189 | 0 | 04 | 30 |
| | 190 | 0 | 00 | 26 |
| | 191 | 0 | 00 | 30 |
| | 187/1 | 0 | 00 | 08 |
| | 188/1 | 0 | 00 | 40 |
| | 189/1 | 0 | 00 | 71 |
| | 207/1 | 0 | 00 | 17 |
| | 208/1 | 0 | 00 | 93 |
| | 208/2 | 0 | 00 | 42 |
| | 208/1 | 0 | 03 | 07 |
| | 216/1 | 0 | 02 | 65 |
| | 217/1 | 0 | 01 | 25 |
| | 218/1 | 0 | 01 | 87 |
| | 222/1 | 0 | 01 | 48 |
| | 226 | 0 | 06 | 24 |
| | 230/1 | 0 | 00 | 33 |
| | 757/2 | 0 | 06 | 69 |
| | 757/3 | 0 | 00 | 98 |
| | 756/1 | 0 | 02 | 05 |
| | 758 | 0 | 02 | 88 |
| | 759/1 | 0 | 00 | 51 |
| | 761/1 | 0 | 00 | 42 |
| | 762/1 | 0 | 01 | 99 |
| | 193/1 | 0 | 00 | 21 |
| किता .. | 45 | 0 | 81 | 92 |

शुद्धि पत्र

शिमला-171002, 5 जनवरी, 1993

संख्या लो 0 नि 0 (ब) 7(1) 83/92.—इस विभाग द्वारा जारी समसंख्यक प्रशिक्षण सूचना दिनांक 10-9-1992 जो कि मौलन-मौलन सड़क के निर्माण हेतु धारा-4 के अधीन जारी की गई है, में त्रिज्या सौजन के स्थान पर त्रिज्या विरमौर पड़ा जाये।

आदेश द्वारा,
हस्ताक्षरित/-
वित्तियुक्त एवं सचिव।

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 18th June, 1986

No. PLG.FC(F)2-10/83.—At the instance of the Planning Commission the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to set up a Working Group to monitor the maintenance expenditure both under Plan and Non-Plan Schemes/Projects during the Seventh Plan Period.

2. The composition of the Working Group will be as follows :—

1. Financial Commissioner(Finance)- *Chairman cum-Secretary (Planning).*
2. Commissioner-cum-Secretary PW&IPH) *Member.*
3. Commissioner-cum-Secretary(Health) *Member.*
4. Joint Secretary (Expenditure) *Member.*
5. Deputy Secretary (Budget) *Member.*
6. Engineer-in-Chief *Member.*
7. Chief Engineer (I&PH) *Member.*
8. Director (Health Services) *Member.*
9. Director (Planning) *Member-Secretary.*

3. The terms and reference to the Working Group will be as under :—

- (i) To monitor the progress of maintenance expenditure both under Plan and Non-Plan.
- (ii) Structure of maintenance expenditure in the State budget for the assets created in the public sector, and in the budget of Local Bodies/Corporate Sector.
- (iii) Examine the scope of assigning the first charges on resources of the Plan for maintenance of capital assets created at great cost in the past.
- (iv) Suggest and explore ways and means for effecting continuous improvement in the Standards of maintenance.

By order,

Sd/-
F.C.-cum-Secretary.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-2, the 24th May, 1986

No. Rev.D(A)2-8/82.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under clause (b) of sub-section (1) of Section 28 of the Himachal Pradesh Land Revenue Act, 1953 (Act No. 6 of 1954) and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to confer upon Deva Singh Negi 'A' Class Tehsildar candidate under training all the powers of Assistant Collector II Grade under the said Act to be exercised by him in respect of Tehsil Kangra, of District Kangra, with effect from 1-4-85 to 30-9-86.

Shimla-2, the 24th May, 1986

No. Rev.D(A)2-8/82.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under clause (b) of sub-section (1) of Section 28 of the Himachal Pradesh Land Revenue Act, 1953 (Act No. 6 of 1954) and all other powers enabling him in this behalf the, Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to confer upon Shri Rameshwar Sharma 'A' Class Tehsildar candidate all the powers of Assistant Collector II Grade under the said Act to be exercised by him within the local limits of Theog Tehsil of Shimla District with immediate effect.

Shimla-2, the 26th May, 1986

No. Rev.D(A)2-7/82.—In partial modification of this Department Notification of even No. dated the 9th April, 1986, and in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause (b) of sub-section (1) of Section 28 of the Himachal Pradesh Land Revenue Act, 1953 (Act No. 6 of 1954) and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to direct S/Shri Shekhar Gupta and Sandeep Bhatnagar, HAS probationers, shall exercise the powers conferred therein in District Mandi and Una respectively instead of the Una and Bilaspur district as mentioned therein.

Shimla-2, the 28th May, 1986

No. Rev.D(A)2-9/82.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under clause (a) of sub-section (1) of Section 28 of the Himachal Pradesh Land Revenue Act, 1953 (Act No. 6 of 1954) and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to confer upon Sh. V. C. Katoch, Sub-Divisional Officer (Civil), Sarkaghat, all the powers of the Collector under the said Act, to be exercised by him within the local jurisdiction of Sub-Division Sarkaghat, with immediate effect.

PONG DAM CELL

CORRIGENDUM

Shimla-2, the 10th June, 1986

No. 4-9/79-Rev.Cell—In continuation of this Department's notification of even number dated 17-6-85 issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order the following modifications in column "Khasra No." of the specification :—

"Khasra No.1098/611/2 may be substituted in place of Khasra No. 1039/611/2 and Kh. No. 1106/917/656/1 may be substituted in place of 1106/911/656/1."

[Authorised english text of this Department Notification No.Rev.D(A)2-2/82 dated 17-6-86, as required under Article 348 (3) of the Constitution of India].

NOTIFICATIONS

Shimla-2, the 17th June, 1986

No.Rev.D(A)2-2/82.—In exercise of the powers vested in him under clause (a) of Sub Section (1) of Section 28 of the Himachal Pradesh Land Revenue Act, 1954 (Act No.6 of 1954) the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to confer upon Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner, Municipal Corporation Shimla all the powers of the Collector for the purposes of recovery of Corporation dues, under the said Act, to be exercised by them within the local limits of Shimla Municipal Corporation Shimla with immediate effect.

[Authoritative English text of H. P. Government notification No. 4-23/83-Pong Cell, dated 30-8-86 as required under Article 348 (3) of the Constitution of India].

(Pong Dam Cell)

Shimla-2, the 30th August, 1986

No. 4-23/83-Pong Cell.—Whereas the Government of Himachal Pradesh no longer require at public expense for a public purpose the land specified herein below;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 48 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to withdraw the land acquisition proceedings with respect to which a notification under section 4 of the said Act was issued by the Punjab Government vide No. 24275/BPA-3561-62, dated 10-11-1964 published in the Punjab Government Official Gazette dated 20-11-1964 and subsequent declaration under section 6 of the said Act issued by the H.P. Government vide notification No. 4-1/69-Rev.-II, dated 18-1-1969 and published in H.P. Gazette on 20-9-1969 for acquiring land for the reservoir area of Beas Dam in Tikka Ban-Dodru Hadbast No. 73/1 of Village Ghalaur-II, Tehsil Dehra, District Kangra.

SPECIFICATION

District: KANGRA Tehsil: DEHRA

| Village | Khasra No. | H. B. No. | Area in K. M. |
|------------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 5 |
| Ghalaur-II | 7/2/1 | 73/1 | 6 11 |
| (Tikka | 10/2/1 | | 6 16 |
| Bandodru) | 11/2/1 | | 0 15 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|----------|--------|---|------|-------|
| | 12/2 | | 1 | 5 |
| | 13/2 | | 1 | 17 |
| | 14/2/1 | | 1 | 10 |
| | 21/1/1 | | 18 | 3 |
| | 21/2/2 | | 6 | 10 |
| | 29/2/1 | | 5 | 8 |
| Kitta .. | 9 | | 49 | 00 |
| | | | or | |
| | | | 4.65 | Acres |

By order.
Sd/-
Secretary.

परिवहन विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला-2, 13 जनवरी, 1993

संख्या 6-1/89-परि०.—वत: भारत के राष्ट्रपति को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन नामक गांव रिकॉगपीओ, तहसील कला, जिला किन्नौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश में मिनी वन ब्रिड का निर्माण हेतु भूमि अर्जन करना अपेक्षित है। अतएव एनडू द्वारा यह अधिसूचना जारी जाता है कि उक्त परिक्षेत्र में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणी में निर्दिष्ट किया गया है, उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि अर्जन करना अपेक्षित है।

यह अधिसूचना ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों को, जो इससे सम्बन्धित हो सकते हैं की जानकारी के लिए भूमि अर्जन अधिनियम 1894 की धारा-4 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाती है।

पूर्वोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारत के राष्ट्रपति, इन समय इस उपक्रम में कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों, उनके कर्मचारियों और अधिकारियों को इलाके की किसी भी भूमि में प्रवेश करने और सर्वेक्षण करने तथा इन धारा द्वारा अपेक्षित या अनुमान अन्य सभी कार्यों को करने के लिए सहप्राधिकार देते हैं।

कोई भी ऐसा हिमाचल व्यक्ति, जिसे उक्त परिक्षेत्र में कथित भूमि के अर्जन करने पर कोई शंका हो तो वह इन अधिसूचना के प्रकाशित होने की 30 दिनों की अवधि के भीतर लिखित रूप में समाह्वान, कला जिला किन्नौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश के नजदिकी प्राधिकार दापर कर सकता है:-

| विवरण | | तारीख: कला |
|---------------|----------|---------------------|
| जिला: किन्नौर | | |
| गांव | खसरा नं० | रकबा हैक्टेयरों में |
| रिकॉगपीओ | 345/1 | 0 00 28 |
| | 347 | 0 02 52 |
| | 365/1 | 0 00 45 |
| | 346/1 | 0 00 82 |
| | 342/1 | 0 00 20 |
| कित्ता | 5 | 0 04 27 |

आदेश द्वारा,
हस्ताक्षर/-
वित्तियुक्त एवं सचिव।

भाग 2-वैधानिक नियमों को छोड़ कर विभिन्न विभागों के अध्यक्षों और जिला मैजिस्ट्रेटों द्वारा अधिसूचनाएं इत्यादि
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF
POLICE, HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA-1.

ORDER

Shimla-1, the 23rd November, 1992

No. Estt. III (A.S.)/88-45003-B.—Since all efforts for the service of below mentioned notice on Smt. Anita Suri c/o Smt. Kanta Suri, Suri Niwas, Sanjauli, Shimla-6, clerk of this office have failed, hence, the same is now served on her from the date of publication through Himachal Pradesh Government Gazette as well as leading news papers.

In pursuance of sub-rule (1) of Rule 5 of the Central Civil Services (Temporary Service) Rules, 1965, I, R. R. Verma, Director General of Police, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-1, hereby give notice to Smt. Anita Suri, clerk that her services shall stand terminated with effect from the date of expiry of a period of one month from the date on which this notice is served on, or as the case may be, tendered to her.

R. R. VERMA,

*Director General of Police,
Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-1.*

उद्योग विभाग

(भौमिकीय शाखा)

लघु खनिज खानों की नीलामी सूचना

शिमला-1, 5 जनवरी 1993

"मर्म साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि जिला ऊना की लघु खनिज खानों की नीलामी महा-प्रबन्धक, जिला उद्योग केन्द्र, ऊना के कार्यालय में दिनांक 25-1-93 के स्थान पर अब दिनांक 25-2-93 को प्रातः 11.00 बजे की जाएगी। इच्छुक व्यक्ति खानों के पूर्ण विवरण, जहाँ तथा खानों से सम्बन्धित अन्य जानकारी के लिए महाप्रबन्धक, जिला उद्योग केन्द्र, ऊना से सम्पर्क स्थापित करें।

जिला ऊना की लघु खनिज खानों का नीलामी प्रस्ताव

| क्रम संख्या 1 | खान का नाम 2 | खसरा नं० 3 | क्षेत्र 4 | मौजा 5 | खनिज का नाम 6 | अवधि 7 |
|------------------|---|--|---|----------------|-------------------|-----------|
| 1. | बाथड़ी खान बाथड़ी गांव में दर्शाये गये खसरा नम्बरों सहित। | 79 81 82 83 91 87 84 206 207 208 209 210 212 286 292 294 295 594 296 547 567 568 607 620 616 621 622 | 235 09 45 07 76 04 142 08 7 07 2 05 92 18 1 05 4 00 2 12 2 05 3 16 1 16 12 06 8 05 9 09 8 04 10 13 11 03 3 03 1 10 3 04 14 11 6 03 2 18 3 16 3 14 | बाथड़ी क्षेत्र | रेत, पन्थर, बजरी | एक वर्ष |
| 2. | करलूही खान गांव करलूही में दर्शाये गये खसरा नम्बरों सहित। | 128 129 130 138 139 174 175 356 363 | (हैक्टर) 0 13 10 0 03 84 0 03 68 0 00 68 0 00 16 0 00 72 0 09 1 0 01 64 0 01 44 0 01 44 | करलूही खान | रेत, बजरी व पत्थर | एक वर्ष |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|--------|---------|---|---|---|
| | | 366 | 0 09 77 | | | |
| | | 445 | 0 02 54 | | | |
| | | 463 | 0 04 53 | | | |
| | | 519 | 0 18 54 | | | |
| | | 533 | 0 02 41 | | | |
| | | 623 | 0 00 64 | | | |
| | | 626 | 0 02 20 | | | |
| | | 629 | 0 03 49 | | | |
| | | 640 | 0 09 79 | | | |
| | | 651 | 0 00 88 | | | |
| | | 653 | 0 09 93 | | | |
| | | 734 | 1 00 31 | | | |
| | | 738 | 0 12 78 | | | |
| | | 749 | 0 01 30 | | | |
| | | 820 | 0 00 48 | | | |
| | | 875 | 0 07 36 | | | |
| | | 889 | 0 11 40 | | | |
| | | 892 | 0 06 40 | | | |
| | | 893 | 0 05 28 | | | |
| | | 894 | 0 58 24 | | | |
| | | 896 | 0 19 75 | | | |
| | | 924 | 0 26 65 | | | |
| | | 926 | 0 33 91 | | | |
| | | 932 | 0 00 40 | | | |
| | | 932 | 0 03 38 | | | |
| | | 1071 | 0 78 27 | | | |
| | | 1027 | 0 02 56 | | | |
| | | 1063 | 0 78 08 | | | |
| | | 1064 | 0 60 37 | | | |
| | | 1077 | 0 03 64 | | | |
| | | 1193 | 0 02 10 | | | |
| | | 1194 | 0 02 64 | | | |
| | | 1224 | 0 04 65 | | | |
| | | 1226 | 0 03 27 | | | |
| | | 1381 | 0 01 54 | | | |
| | | 1382 | 0 02 22 | | | |
| | | 1384 | 0 01 38 | | | |
| | | 1457 | 0 07 21 | | | |
| | | 1471 | 0 03 77 | | | |
| | | 1484 | 0 00 96 | | | |
| | | 1485 | 0 03 27 | | | |
| | | 1487 | 0 02 10 | | | |
| | | 1490 | 0 00 20 | | | |
| | | 1492 | 0 01 46 | | | |
| | | 1495 | 0 07 71 | | | |
| | | 1587 | 0 00 69 | | | |
| | | 1613/1 | 0 01 44 | | | |
| | | 1620 | 0 62 18 | | | |
| | | 1625 | 0 25 04 | | | |
| | | 1673 | 0 02 74 | | | |
| | | 1676 | 0 02 21 | | | |
| | | 1681 | 0 34 41 | | | |
| | | 1689 | 0 08 35 | | | |
| | | 1690 | 0 03 96 | | | |
| | | 1692 | 0 22 82 | | | |
| | | 1703 | 0 32 90 | | | |
| | | 1733 | 0 02 94 | | | |
| | | 1704 | 0 02 34 | | | |
| | | 1811 | 0 07 83 | | | |
| | | 1819 | 0 17 05 | | | |
| | | 1855 | 0 03 71 | | | |
| | | 1908 | 0 07 82 | | | |
| | | 2000 | 0 01 53 | | | |
| | | 2011 | 0 04 20 | | | |
| | | 2055 | 0 05 10 | | | |
| | | 2090 | 0 05 54 | | | |
| | | 2095 | 0 19 53 | | | |
| | | 498 | 0 24 53 | | | |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|----|---|-----------|---------|---------------|------------------|---------|
| | | 505 | 2 85 92 | | | |
| | | 517 | 2 16 33 | | | |
| | | 442 | 0 07 44 | | | |
| | | 444 | 0 06 30 | | | |
| | | 506 | 0 47 43 | | | |
| | | 237 | 0 06 08 | | | |
| | | 510 | 0 15 52 | | | |
| | | 512 | 0 34 57 | | | |
| | | 514 | 5 12 04 | | | |
| | | 236 | 0 11 60 | | | |
| | | 361 | 0 01 69 | | | |
| | | 443 | 0 07 28 | | | |
| | | 465 | 0 35 07 | | | |
| | | 522 | 2 61 03 | | | |
| | | 526 | 3 33 22 | | | |
| | | 1019 | 5 46 33 | | | |
| | | 1070 | 0 10 15 | | | |
| | | 1079 | 0 03 27 | | | |
| | | 1082 | 0 38 78 | | | |
| | | 1087 | 0 83 73 | | | |
| | | 1100 | 1 37 39 | | | |
| | | 1101 | 0 02 26 | | | |
| | | 1105 | 0 83 52 | | | |
| | | 1179 | 2 97 77 | | | |
| | | 1183 | 0 13 30 | | | |
| | | 1182 | 0 16 19 | | | |
| | | 1015 | 5 85 80 | | | |
| | | 1018 | 2 18 22 | | | |
| | | 1020 | 0 79 92 | | | |
| | | 1016/1 | 1 28 75 | | | |
| | | 362 | 0 09 63 | | | |
| | | 365 | 0 09 47 | | | |
| | | 884 | 5 88 47 | | | |
| | | 897 | 0 32 28 | | | |
| | | 1065 | 0 03 96 | | | |
| | | 1067 | 0 20 54 | | | |
| | | 257 | 0 11 72 | | | |
| | | 1080 | 0 37 00 | | | |
| 3. | गोंदपुर खान (गाँव गोंदपुर में दर्शाये गए खमरा नम्बरों सहित) | 3447 | 46 01 | गोंदपुर जैचंद | रेत, बजरी, पत्थर | एक वर्ष |
| | | 3448 | 60 05 | | | |
| | | 3449 | 00 18 | | | |
| | | 3450 | 00 10 | | | |
| | | 3451 | 00 13 | | | |
| | | 3452 | 10 11 | | | |
| | | 3453 | 10 09 | | | |
| | | 3454 | 10 12 | | | |
| | | 3556 | 15 08 | | | |
| | | 3457 | 15 06 | | | |
| | | 3458 | 07 19 | | | |
| | | 3459 | 10 19 | | | |
| | | 3574 | 06 01 | | | |
| | | 3575 | 03 18 | | | |
| | | 3576 | 05 04 | | | |
| | | 3577 | 25 17 | | | |
| | | 3578 | 22 12 | | | |
| | | 3579 | 47 12 | | | |
| | | 3580 | 24 09 | | | |
| | | 3581 | 10 07 | | | |
| | | 3582 | 06 08 | | | |
| | | 3583 | 65 13 | | | |
| | | 3584 | 15 18 | | | |
| | | 3585 | 10 07 | | | |
| | | 3586 | 19 06 | | | |
| | | 3500 | 01 00 | | | |
| | | 2123 | 25 13 | गोंदपुर बल्लू | | |
| | | 2130 | 03 08 | | | |
| | | 2139/3584 | 02 09 | | | |
| | | 3585/2139 | 01 17 | | | |

| 1- | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|----|-----------------------------|-------------|-------|---------------|-------------------|---------|
| | | 2172 | 05 17 | | | |
| | | 2175 | 63 18 | | | |
| | | 2176 | 02 19 | | | |
| | | 2343 | 7 19 | | | |
| | | 2346 | 14 15 | | | |
| | | 2345 | 6 18 | | | |
| | | 3731/3374 | 02 18 | | | |
| | | 3732/3374 | 2 10 | | | |
| | | 3735/3375 | 4 00 | | | |
| | | 3736/3375 | 6 06 | | | |
| | | 3737/3375 | 6 06 | | | |
| | | 2347 | 0 18 | | | |
| | | 2348 | 06 18 | | | |
| | | 2349 | 12 16 | | | |
| | | 2350 | 9 17 | | | |
| | | 2351 | 13 14 | | | |
| | | 2397 | 32 01 | | | |
| | | 2390 | 7 10 | | | |
| | | 2395 | 10 05 | | | |
| | | 2405 | 11 19 | | | |
| | | 2406 | 10 00 | | | |
| | | 2407 | 23 06 | | | |
| | | 2408 | 1 00 | | | |
| | | 2415 | 4 14 | | | |
| 4. | ककराना | 1029 | 0 8 | दीहरा | रेत, बजरी व पत्थर | एक वर्ष |
| | गांव ककराना में दर्शाये गये | 1042 } 1045 | | | | |
| | खसरा नम्बरों सहित | 1031 } | 0 16 | | | |
| | | 1047/1049 | 1 19 | | | |
| | | 1048/1050 | 1 01 | | | |
| | | 1023/1039 | 1 15 | | | |
| | | 1087/1093/ | 2 17 | | | |
| | | 1097 | | | | |
| | | 1185/ | | | | |
| | | 1109 | 2 00 | | | |
| | | 1093/ | | | | |
| | | 1186/ | | | | |
| | | 1110 | 0 2 | | | |
| | | 1093/ | | | | |
| 5. | ईसपुर खान | 2 | 8 00 | ईसपुर क्षेत्र | यथो | यथो |
| | गांव ईसपुर में दर्शाये गये | 9 | 8 00 | | | |
| | खसरा नम्बरों सहित | 12 | 8 03 | | | |
| | | 19 | 7 17 | | | |
| | | 22/1 | 7 12 | | | |
| | | 16 | 8 00 | | | |
| | | 17 | 8 00 | | | |
| | | 24 | 8 00 | | | |
| | | 25 | 8 00 | | | |
| | | 13 | 7 12 | | | |
| | | 14 | 8 00 | | | |
| | | 15 | 8 00 | | | |
| | | 16 | 7 07 | | | |
| | | 17 | 7 07 | | | |
| | | 18 | 6 19 | | | |
| | | 25 | 8 00 | | | |
| | | 3 | 8 00 | | | |
| | | 4/1 | 6 13 | | | |
| | | 5 | 8 00 | | | |
| | | 2 | 9 04 | | | |
| | | 11/2 | 5 18 | | | |
| | | 20 | 8 00 | | | |
| 6. | बडेड़ा खान | 1197 | 31 17 | बडेड़ा | यथो | यथो |
| | गांव बडेड़ा में दर्शाये गये | 1190 | 5 06 | | | |
| | खसरा नम्बरों सहित | 4894 | 21 12 | | | |
| | | 4889 | 15 19 | | | |
| | | 4899 | 1 09 | | | |
| | | 6894 | 4 02 | | | |
| | | 7171 | 11 07 | | | |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|----|---|--|--|--|----------------------------|---------|
| | | 7184 | 15 | 14 | | |
| | | 7186 | 11 | 18 | | |
| | | 7187 | 6 | 16 | | |
| | | 684 | 8 | 01 | | |
| | | 2305 | 10 | 00 | | |
| | | 4888 | 30 | 00 | | |
| | | 6720 | 5 | 10 | | |
| | | 6776 | 20 | 08 | | |
| | | 5353 | 12 | 19 | | |
| | | 7383 | 4 | 15 | | |
| | | 7384 | 3 | 19 | | |
| | | 5355 | 26 | 16 | | |
| | | 6714 | 15 | 08 | | |
| | | 2302 | 15 | 00 | | |
| | | 5366 | 15 | 01 | | |
| | | 2323 | 11 | 18 | | |
| | | 5363 | 5 | 00 | | |
| | | 5365 | 8 | 00 | | |
| | | 3966 | 41 | 13 | | |
| | | 1195 | 13 | 02 | | |
| | | 4822 | 7 | 12 | | |
| | | 6791 | 6 | 11 | | |
| | | 7380 | 14 | 04 | | |
| | | 7381 | 15 | 00 | | |
| | | 2251 | 4 | 11 | | |
| | | 2262/2 | 12 | 18 | | |
| | | 2263/2 | 21 | 12 | | |
| | | 2262/1 | 11 | 02 | | |
| | | 3624 | 25 | 19 | | |
| | | 3964 | 70 | 01 | | |
| | | 2250 | 21 | 11 | | |
| | | 3965 | 41 | 13 | | |
| | | 6502 | 13 | 01 | | |
| | | 7220 | 4 | 13 | | |
| | | 2284 | 26 | 08 | | |
| | | 3969 | 46 | 06 | | |
| | | 3270 | 11 | 14 | | |
| | | 7219 | 10 | 07 | | |
| | | 7238 | 4 | 19 | | |
| | | 7389 | 21 | 03 | | |
| | | 6579 | 24 | 16 | | |
| | | 3961 | 82 | 06 | | |
| | | 3967 | 14 | 08 | | |
| | | 3968 | 46 | 05 | | |
| | | 3862 | 45 | 05 | | |
| 7. | धर्मपुर खान गांव धर्मपुर में दर्शाये गए खसरा नम्बरों सहित । | 26/1 51 58 367 409 600 601 654 862 | 9 3 23 59 85 9 150 8 133 | 10 19 07 00 02 13 00 15 05 | धर्मपुर रेत, बजरी पत्थर | एक वर्ष |

नीलामी निम्नलिखित नियमों एवं शर्तों के आधार पर की जा रहा है :-

1. नीलामी विक्रय के नियम व शर्तें हिमाचल प्रदेश नष्ट खनिज (रियायत) संशोधन नियमावली, 1971 के अनुसार नीलामी स्थल पर उद्घोषित की जाएगी।
2. बोली प्रति वार्षिक होगी।
3. कोई भी व्यक्ति जो बोली देने के इच्छुक हो वह पीठासीन अधिकारी के फीस 100/- रु 00 अग्रिम धन अग्रिम रूप में जमा करवाएगा। जो बोली समाप्त होने पर बोलीदाताओं को वापिस कर दी जाएगी।
4. बोलीदाता बोली देने से पहले उनकी अपनी रुचि में खानों का निरीक्षण कर सकते हैं।
5. पीठासीन अधिकारी को अधिकार दिये गए हैं कि वह विभिन्न खानों का एक समूह व एक खान के छोटे भाग बिना कारण बताये कर सकता है।
6. बोलीदाता सरकार को देय राशि का बाकीदार नहीं होना चाहिए। कोई बोलीदाता जो बोली पाया जाए को उस नीलामी में भाग लेने की अनुमति नहीं दी जायेगी।

7. ठेके की अवधि स्लेट खानों के अतिरिक्त ठेकों की स्वीकृत तिथि से एक वर्ष तक होगी व स्लेट खानों के मामलों में 5 वर्ष की होगी।
8. नीलामी पूर्ण होने पर परिणाम घोषित कर दिये जाएंगे और अस्थाई तौर से चयन किए गए बोलीदाता निम्न तरीकों में नीलामी की बांछित राशि पीठासीन अधिकारी के पास जमा करवाएंगे।

जहां पर बोली की राशि 1000/- रु प्रतिवर्ष की दर से अधिक होगी उस अवस्था में उच्च बोलीदाता बोली की 25% राशि प्रतिभूति राशि के तौर पर तथा बोली की 25% राशि पहली किश्त के रूप में जमा करवाएगा। यदि उच्चतम बोली 1000/- रु या इससे कम हो तो उस अवस्था में पूरी वार्षिक बोली की राशि के अतिरिक्त 25% प्रतिभूति राशि के तौर पर जमा करवाएगा/यदि कोई उच्च बोलीदाता बोली की बांछित राशि जमा न करवाये तो उस अवस्था में उस द्वारा जमा किया गया अग्रिम धन जब्त कर दिया जाएगा।

9. सरकार को अधिकार है कि वे उच्चतम बोली को बिना किसी कारण बताये स्वीकार या अस्वीकार कर सकती है।
10. सरकार को अधिकार है कि वे ठेके की अवधि बढ़ा या घटा सकती है।
11. कोई भी खनन कार्य पुल से, राष्ट्रीय उच्च मार्ग व राज्य उच्च मार्ग से क्रमशः 75 मीटर, 60 मीटर व 50 मीटर को दूरी तक नहीं किया जाएगा।
12. बोली के दौरान यदि कोई बोलीदाता दुर्व्यवहार करे, तो पीठासीन अधिकारी को यह अधिकार होगा कि वह उस द्वारा जमा की गई अग्रिम राशि जब्त करते हुए उसे बोली में भाग नहीं लेने देगा व उसे 3 माह के लिए भविष्य की बोली में हिस्सा न लेने के लिए अयोग्य घोषित कर सकता है।
13. बोली केवल उसी अवस्था में स्वीकृत समझी जाएगी जब इसके स्वीकृति आदेश सरकार से अथवा किसी दूसरे मखम अधिकारी द्वारा जारी हों।
14. नीलामी के लिए अधिसूचित लघु खनिज खानों का क्षेत्र अधिसूचना में दर्शाया गया हो मान्य होगा। इसके अतिरिक्त खानों के स्थल, नक्शे, रातस्व रिकार्ड जो सम्बन्धित खनिज अधिकारी/महाप्रबन्धक के पास होंगे, उनपर दिखाया गया क्षेत्र भी अधिसूचित लघु खनिज खानों का क्षेत्र मान्य होगा।
15. खड्डों/दरिया में खनन कार्य उनके दोनों किनारे से 5 मीटर की दूरी तक नहीं किया जायेगा।
16. नीलामी की गई लघु खनिज खानों का कब्जा उसी अवस्था में दिवा जाएगा जब वर्तमान ठेके की अवधि समाप्त होगी।
17. बोली में हिस्सा लेने वाले बोलीदाता बोली के मध्य प्रान्ती आपत्ति उठा सकते हैं। बोली समाप्त होने पर किसी प्रकार की आपत्ति पर मुनवाई नहीं की जाएगी।
18. ठेकेदार हिमाचल प्रदेश लघु खनिज (रियायतें) संशोधित नियमावली, 1971 के नियम-33 के अन्तर्गत स्वीकृति आदेश प्राप्त होने की तिथि से 3 माह के भीतर शर्तनाम पर हस्ताक्षर करेगा। यदि शर्तनाम पर हस्ताक्षर करने में ठेकेदार इस अवधि के मध्य असफल रहे तो उस अवस्था में ठेका रद्द समझा जाएगा तथा उस द्वारा जमा करवाई गई प्रतिभूति राशि एवं प्रथम किश्त की राशि जब्त कर दी जाएगी।
19. लघु खनिज खानों जो नीलामी के लिए अधिसूचित की गई हों, यदि उनका सीमांकन न किया गया हो तो ऐसी खानों को नीलामी में शामिल नहीं किया जाएगा।
20. यदि कोई बोलीदाता अधिसूचित खानों के बारे में जानकारी प्राप्त करना चाहता हो, वे सम्बन्धित खनिज अधिकारी/महा प्रबन्धक से सम्पर्क स्थापित करें।
21. जहां कहीं भी स्पेन द्वारा खनिजों की ढुनवाई करने की आवश्यकता हो तो उस अवस्था में स्पेन की अलाटमेंट को ठेकेदार द्वारा विभाग से अनुमोदित करवाना आवश्यक होगा।
22. नदी/नालों की नीलामी के लिए प्राकृतिक लक्षण के आधार पर अधिसूचित किया गया है, इन क्षेत्रों में यदि वन भूमि का स्वीकृत खनन पट्टे पड़े, तो उनमें खनिजों के एकत्रीकरण पर ठेकेदार का कोई हक न होगा। यदि इन क्षेत्रों में निजी भूमि पड़ती हो, तो उस अवस्था में ठेकेदार खनिजों का एकत्रीकरण करने से पूर्व निजी भूमि मालिकों से सहमति पत्र प्राप्त करके विभाग को प्रस्तुत करेगा तथा उसी अवस्था में ठेकेदार ऐसी भूमि पर खनिजों के एकत्रीकरण का अधिकार रखेगा, यदि भूमि मालिक किसी ठेकेदार के पक्ष में दिया गया सहमति पत्र भी मान्य नहीं होगा। उस अवस्था में क्षेत्र से न ही भूमि मालिक और न ही अन्य व्यक्ति (ठेकेदार को छोड़कर) खनिजों का एकत्रीकरण कर पाएगा। अर्थात् स्थल पर खनिजों के अधिकार ठेकेदार के ही होंगे।
23. अधिसूचित लघु खनिज खानों के मखम लिबे गर नष्ट खनिजों के अतिरिक्त यदि किसी दूसरे खनिज की निकासी/निर्यात ठेकेदार उस क्षेत्र से करता है तो उस अवस्था में नष्ट खनिज खनिज पर अतिरिक्त रायल्टी नियमानुसार अदा करनी आवश्यक होगी।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
निदेशक।

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL MANAGER, DISTRICT INDUSTRIES CENTRE MANDI H.P.

NOTICE UNDER SECTION 24 OF THE ACT

Mandi, the 7th January, 1993

No. Ind. 9/Loan/MND/9203-6.—Whereas a notice was served to Shri Narain Dass son of Shri Jodha Ram resident of Village Balh, Post Office Pali, Tehsil Jogindernagar on 5-3-84 under section 23 of the Himachal Pradesh State Aid to Industries Act, 1971 calling upon the said Shri Narain Dass to pay to me the sum of Rs. -nil- and interest Rs. 7890/- there upon upto date on or before 21 days and whereas the said sum has not been paid, I here by declare that the sum of Rs. -nil- (Rupees) only is due from the said and interest thereon Rupees

Seven thousand, eight hundred ninty upto date is due from the said Shri Narain Dass and that the property described in the attached schedule is liable for the satisfaction of the said debt.

SCHEDULE

Land of Shri Narain Dass comprised khasra No. 98, 109, 116/1, 120, 128 measuring 24 bighas 6 biswas 6 biswansi situated in Village Darang, Post Office Darang, Tehsil Jogindernagar, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh valued Rs. 11326-35 paise.

S. P. SOOD,
General Manager,
District Industries Centre, Mandi.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL MANAGER, DISTRICT INDUSTRIES CENTRE MANDI, (H.P.)

NOTICE UNDER SECTION 24 OF THE ACT

Mandi, the 7th January, 1993

No. Ind. 9/Loan/MND/9199-9202.—Whereas a notice was served to Shri Mukand Ram Khatri son of Shri Niku Ram, resident of Rakkar, Post Office Kunnu Tehsil Jogindernagar on 5-3-84 under section 23 of Himachal Pradesh State Aid to Industries Act, 1971 calling upon the said Shri Mukand Ram Khatri to pay to me the sum of Rs. 6000/- and interest thereon upto date on or before 21 days and whereas the said sum has not been paid, I hereby declare that the sum of Rs. 6000/- (Rupees Six thousand) only is due from the said and interest thereon upto date is due from the said Shri Mukand Ram and that the property described in the attached schedule is liable for the satisfaction of the said debt.

SCHEDULE

Landed property measuring 55-56 sq. meter comprising Khebat No. 373/641-642 kitta to 1/36 Hissa, No. 774/643 kitta 1/226 Hissa and 366/546-549 kitta 1/6 Hissa valuing Rs. 9,165.27, situated in Bhagwan Muhalla Mandi, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh.

S. P. SOOD,
General Manager,
District Industries Centre, Mandi.

कार्यालय उपायुक्त जिमला, जिला जिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

अधिसूचना

जिमला, 4 जनवरी, 1993

संख्या जि० वि० (716)/91-236-58.—डली बाजार के क्षेत्र में सरकारी तथा गैर-सरकारी वाहनों के आवागमन के कारण सड़क यातायात वाहनों के अनावश्यक ठहराव के कारण अवरोध रहता है। वाहनों के पार्क करने की व्यवस्था पर सचिव, अधिसूचित क्षेत्र डली, में प्राप्त प्रस्ताव पर पुनः अधीक्षक जिमला की टिप्पणी प्राप्त की गई तथा डली बाजार क्षेत्र में वाहन के पार्किंग

स्थलों को चिह्नित करने के विषय पर ध्यानपूर्वक विचार करने के उपरान्त यह उचित समझा गया है कि डली बाजार में सड़क यातायात को सुचारु रूप से चलाये जाने के हित में यह आवश्यक है कि वाहनों के पार्किंग स्थलों को अधिसूचित कर दिया जाये।

अतः, मैं, पी० सी० कपूर, भा० प्र० से०, जिला दण्डाधिकारी, जिमला, मोटर वाहन अधिनियम, 1988 की धारा-117 में प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधिसूचित क्षेत्र समिति डली, जिला-12 में निम्नलिखित पार्किंग स्थलों को चिह्नित करके अधिसूचित करता हूँ—

1. सामान उतारने तथा चढ़ाने के लिए ठहराव:

1. मैसर्स गिरीश रिकरिंगमेट के सामने .. एक छोटी गाड़ी

2. अधिसूचित क्षेत्र समिति के कार्यालय के सामने .. एक बड़ी गाड़ी

2. मुरम्त के लिए गाड़ियों के पार्किंग का स्थान:

1. मशीनर, कुकरी दो सड़कों में समिति की दुकानों के पास .. एक बड़ी गाड़ी

2. मैसर्स युनिवर्सल एन्ड टायर कम्पनी के पास .. एक छोटी गाड़ी

3. केवल ब्रदर्स की दुकान के पास .. एक छोटी गाड़ी

4. मच्छर को दुकान के पास .. एक छोटी गाड़ी

5. शर्मा बैलिंग तथा गुरु नानक बकस के पास .. एक छोटी गाड़ी

6. डोमरा मोटरज के पास .. एक छोटी गाड़ी

यह अधिसूचना तत्काल लागू होगी और अगले आदेशों तक लागू रहेगी।

पी० सी० कपूर,
जिला दण्डाधिकारी, जिमला।

भाग 3—अधिनियम, विधेयक और विधेयकों पर प्रवर समिति के प्रतिवेदन, वैधानिक नियम तथा हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश हाई कोर्ट, फाईनेंसियल कमिशनर तथा कमिशनर आफ इन्कम टैक्स द्वारा अधिसूचित आदेश इत्यादि।

आयुक्त विभाग

अधिसूचना

जिमला-2, 28 दिसम्बर, 1992

संख्या स्वास्थ (ए) (3)-12/84.—भारत के राष्ट्रपति, भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तु द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक सेवा आयोग के परामर्श से हिमाचल प्रदेश आयुविज्ञान पद्धति एवं होम्योपैथी विभाग में इस विभाग की समसंयक अधिसूचना तारीख 6 जुलाई, 1989 द्वारा अधिसूचित सहायक/लेक्चरर/मण्डारी/रीकड़िया (वर्ग-III अराजपत्रित) के भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति (प्रथम संशोधन) नियम, 1988 का और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनते हैं, अर्थात्—

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ (1).—इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश भारतीय आयुविज्ञान पद्धति एवं होम्योपैथी विभाग, सहायक/लेक्चरर/मण्डारी/रीकड़िया (वर्ग-III अराजपत्रित) के भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति (प्रथम संशोधन) नियम, 1992 है।

(2) ये नियम हिमाचल प्रदेश राजपत्र में प्रकाशित किए जाने की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. उपाखण्ड-1 के मतम्भ-II और उसके अधीन टिप्पण-1 का संशोधन—1. हिमाचल प्रदेश भारतीय आयुविज्ञान पद्धति एवं होम्योपैथी

विभाग सहायक/लेक्चरर/मण्डारी/रीकड़िया (वर्ग-III अराजपत्रित) के भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियम, 1982 के उपाखण्ड-1 के मतम्भ-II और उसके अधीन टिप्पण-1 में विद्यमान उपाखण्ड के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित उपाखण्ड अन्तःस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात् सामान्य लिपिकीय संवर्ग (कांडर) के लिपिक/वरिष्ठ लिपिक/कनिष्ठ सहायकों जिनका ग्रेड में 10 वर्ष का संयुक्त नियमित सेवाकाल या ग्रेड में 31-3-91 तक की गई लगातार तदर्थ सेवा सहित संयुक्त नियमित सेवाकाल हो मे से प्रोन्नति द्वारा।

टिप्पण-1. प्रोन्नति के सभी मामलों में पद पर नियमित नियुक्ति से पूर्व सम्भरण पद में 31-3-91 तक की गई तदर्थ सेवा, यदि कोई हो, प्रोन्नति के लिए इन नियमों में यथा विहित सेवाकाल के लिए निम्नलिखित भर्ती के अधीन रहते हुए गणना में ली जाएगी—

(क) उन सभी मामलों में जहां कोई कनिष्ठ व्यक्ति सम्भरण पद में अपने कुल सेवाकाल (31-3-91 तक की गई तदर्थ सेवा को शामिल करके) का आधार पर उपयुक्त निदिष्ट उपखण्डों के कारण बिचार किए जाने का पात्र हो जाता है, वहां अपने-अपने प्रवर्ग/पद/केडर में उसके वरिष्ठ सभी व्यक्ति विचार के लिए पात्र समझे जायेंगे और विचार करते समय कनिष्ठ व्यक्ति से ऊपर रखे जायेंगे।

परन्तु उन सभी पदधारियों की जिन पर प्रोन्नति के लिए विचार किया जाता है, कम से कम तीन वर्ष न्यूनतम उर्हता सेवा या पद के भर्ती एवं प्रोन्नति नियमों में विहित सेवा जो भी कम हो होनी चाहिए।

परन्तु यह और भी कि जग कोई व्यक्ति पूर्वागामी परन्तक की अपेक्षाओं के कारणों प्रोन्नति किए जाने से सम्बन्धी विचार के लिए प्रभाव हो जाता है वहां उक्त कनिष्ठ व्यक्ति भी ऐसी प्रोन्नति के लिए अपेक्षा समझा जाएगा।

स्पष्टीकरण :

अन्तिम परन्तक के अन्तर्गत कनिष्ठ पदधारी प्रोन्नति के लिए अपात्र नहीं समझा जाएगा यदि वरिष्ठ पदात्र व्यक्ति अनुपूर्व सैनिक हो, जिसे डिमोबिलाइज्ड आर्मेड फोर्सिज पर्सनल (रिजर्वेशन ऑफ़ वैकेंसीज) रूल, 1972 के नियम-3 के प्रावधानों के अन्तर्गत वरीयता लाभ दिए गए हों या जिसे एकत्र सर्विसमें (रिजर्वेशन ऑफ़ वैकेंसीज रूल, हिमाचल प्रदेश टेक्नीकल सर्विसिज) 1985 के नियम 3 के प्रावधानों के अन्तर्गत वरीयता दिया गया हो व इसके अन्तर्गत वरीयता लाभ दिए गए हों।

(ब) इसी प्रकार स्थायीकरण के सभी मामलों में ऐसे पद पर नियमित नियुक्ति से पूर्व 31-3-1991 तक की गई तदर्थ सेवा, यदि कोई हो, सेवाकाल के लिए गणना में ली जाएगी :

परन्तु 31-3-91 तक तदर्थ सेवा की गणना में लेने के पश्चात् जो स्थायीकरण होगा, उसके फलस्वरूप पारस्परिक वरीयता अपरिवर्तित रहेगी।

अदेशानुसार,

ए० एन० विद्यार्थी,
वित्तियुक्त एवं सचिव।

[Authoritative English Text of this Government Notification No. Health-A(3)-12/84, Dated 28-12-92 as required under clause (3) of Article 343 of the Constitution of India].

AYURVEDA DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 28th December, 1992

No. Health-A (3) 12/84.—In exercise of the powers conferred by proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India, the President of India, in consultation with the Himachal Pradesh Public Service Commission, is pleased to make the following Rules further to amend the Himachal Pradesh Indian System of Medicine and Homeopathy Department, Assistant/Accountant/Store-Keeper/ Cashier (Class-III, Non-Gazetted) Recruitment and promotion Rules, 1988 notified vide this Department Notification of even No., dated 6th July, 1989, as under namely :—

1. *Short title and commencement.*—(1) These Rules may be called the Himachal Pradesh, Indian System of Medicine and Homeopathy Department Assistant/Accountant/Store-Keeper/Cashier (Class-III, Non-Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion (1st amendment) Rules, 1992.

(2). These rules shall come into force from the date of its publication in the Rajpatra, Himachal Pradesh.

2. *Amendment of Col. 11 of Annexure-I and Note-I thereunder.*—For the existing provisions of col. 11 and Note-I thereunder of Annexure-I of the Himachal Pradesh Indian System of Medicine and Homeopathy Department Assistant/Accountant/Store-Keeper/Cashier (Class-III, Non-Gazetted) Recruitment and Promotion Rules, 1988 the following provision shall be substituted, namely:—

By promotion from amongst the common clerical cadre of Clerk/Senior Clerk/ Junior Assistant with 10 years combined regular service or regular combined with continuous *ad hoc* (rendered upto 31-3-91) service in the grade.

Note-I. In all cases of promotion, the *ad hoc* service rendered in the feeder post upto 31-3-91 if any, prior to regular appointment to the post shall be taken

into account towards the length of service as prescribed in these rules for promotion subject to the condition:—

- (a) That in all cases where a junior person becomes eligible for consideration by virtue of his total length of service (including the service rendered *ad hoc* basis upto 31-3-91) in the feeder post in view of the provisions referred to above, all persons senior to him in the respective category/post/cadre shall be deemed to be eligible for consideration and placed above the junior persons in the field of consideration :

Provided that all incumbents to be considered for promotion shall possess the minimum qualifying service of atleast three years or that prescribed in the Recruitment and Promotion Rules for the post, whichever is less :

Provided further that where a person becomes ineligible to be considered for promotion on account of the requirements of the preceding proviso, the person(s) junior to him shall also be deemed to be ineligible for consideration for such promotion.

Explanation :

The last proviso shall not render the junior incumbents ineligible for consideration for promotion if the senior ineligible person happen to be *ex-servicemen* recruited under the provisions of rule 3 of Demobilised Armed Forces Personnel (Reservation of vacancies in Himachal State Non-Technical services) Rules 1972 and having been given the benefit of seniority thereunder or recruited under the provisions of Rule 3 of *Ex-servicemen* (Reservation of vacancies in the Himachal Pradesh Technical Services) Rules 1985, and having been given the benefit of seniority thereunder.

- (b) Similarly, in all cases of confirmation, *ad hoc* service rendered on the feeder post upto 31-3-91, if any prior to the regular appointment against such post shall be taken into account towards the length of service :

Provided that the *inter-se-seniority* as a result of confirmation after taking into account *ad hoc* service rendered upto 31-3-91 shall remain unchanged.

By order,

A. N. VIDYARTHI.

Financial Commissioner-cum-Secretary.

HORTICULTURE DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shim'a-2, the 28th December, 1987

No. Udyan-Kha (8) 10/87.—On the recommendations of the Departmental Promotion Committee, the Governor of Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to promote and appoint Shri Shiv Kumar Jain, Superintendent Grade-II, in the pay scale Rs. 800—1400, as Superintendent Grade-I in the pay scale of Rs. 825—1580 (class-II gazetted) against a newly created post under T & V Project and posted in the Directorate of Horticulture, Naubahar, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla-2.

He shall be on probation for a period of two years from the date of his joining as such.

By order,

S. M. KANWAR,

Financial Commissioner (Dev.)-cum-A. P. C.

श्रम विभाग

शिमला-2, 5 जनवरी, 1993

अधिसूचनाएं

शिमला-2, 5 जनवरी, 1993

संख्या 11-1/86(लेब)आई0डी0 भाग-5.—अधोहस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि श्री धनवीर सिंह पुत्र श्री चूहड़ सिंह, गांव झाल हरिपुर, डाकघर हरिपुर, तहसील पांवडा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर और अरण्यपाल, नाहन वृत्त, नाहन, जिला सिरमौर के मध्य नीचे दिये गये विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा-12(4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रस्तुत की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के पश्चात् अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने लिया है कि यह मामला श्रम न्यायालय को अधिनिर्णय के लिये भेजने योग्य है;

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-श्रम (लूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा-7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किये गये विषय पर अधिनिर्णय देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“कि क्या अरण्यपाल, नाहन वृत्त, नाहन, जिला सिरमौर द्वारा श्री धनवीर सिंह पुत्र श्री चूहड़ सिंह चौकीदार की सेवायें 10-8-1988 से औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा-25 (एफ) के प्रावधानों की पालना किये बिना समाप्त करना उचित एवं न्याय संगत है। यदि नहीं तो कामगार श्री धनवीर सिंह किम राहत एवं क्षतिपूर्ति का हकदार है।”

शिमला-2, 5 जनवरी, 1993

संख्या 11-23/84(लेब)आई0डी0.—अधोहस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि श्री कर्म सिंह पुत्र श्री हाजरी लाल मारफत श्री आर0 के0 सिंह पराशर, संगठन सचिव, पंजाब इंटक, नंगल टाऊन-शिप, जिला रोपड़ और प्रधान तथा प्रिन्सिपल (प्रधानाचार्य) एस0बी0 एस0 डिग्री कालेज, भटोली, डाकघर अजोली (संतोखगढ़)। तहसील व जिला ऊना के मध्य नीचे दिये गये विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा-12(4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रस्तुत की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा-12 की उप-धारा-12(5) के अधीन विचार करने के पश्चात् अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि यह मामला श्रम न्यायालय को अधिनिर्णय के लिये भेजने योग्य है ;

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-श्रम(लूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा-10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा-7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किये गये विषय पर अधिनिर्णय देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“कि क्या श्री कर्म सिंह मुपुत्र श्री हाजरी लाल चपड़ासी को प्रधान एवं प्रधानाचार्य, एस0बी0 एस0 डिग्री कालेज, भटोली, डाकघर अजोली (संतोखगढ़), तहसील व जिला ऊना द्वारा बिना किसी कारण नोटिस व छठनी लाभ के नौकरी से निकालना सही व न्यायोचित है। यदि नहीं तो कामगार श्री कर्म सिंह किम राहत एवं क्षतिपूर्ति के हकदार है।”

संख्या 11-1/85 (लेब) आई0डी0 भाग-II.—अधोहस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि श्री प्रीतम चन्द पुत्र श्री गोरख राम, गांव व डाकघर बड़सर, जिला हमीरपुर और उप-निदेशक, कृषि, हमीरपुर के मध्य नीचे दिये गये विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा-12(4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रस्तुत की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा-12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के पश्चात् अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि यह मामला श्रम न्यायालय को अधिनिर्णय के लिये भेजने योग्य है ;

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-श्रम(लूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा-10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा-7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किये गये विषय पर अधिनिर्णय देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“कि क्या श्री प्रीतम चन्द पुत्र श्री गोरख राम, गांव व डाकघर बड़सर, जिला हमीरपुर को औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा-25(एफ) में दिये गये प्रावधानों की पालना न करत हुए प्रबन्ध पक्ष उप-निदेशक कृषि, हमीरपुर द्वारा दिनांक 1-7-1991 से नौकरी से निकालना सही व न्याय संगत है ? यदि नहीं तो कामगार प्रीतम चन्द किस राहत एवं क्षतिपूर्ति के हकदार है।”

शिमला-2, 5 जनवरी, 1993

संख्या 11-26/84(लेब)आई0डी0 भाग-III.—अधोहस्ताक्षरी को यह प्रतीत होता है कि श्री सलीम मुपुत्र श्री रज्जाक मंसन द्वारा महा-सचिव, जय प्रकाश एसोसियेट्स वर्कर्स यूनियन, गांव तेलरू, डाकघर बनीखेत, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश और महा प्रबन्धक, जय प्रकाश एसोसियेट्स, चमेरा परियोजना (निजि क्षेत्र की ठेकेदार कम्पनी), गांव छान्ना मोड़, डाकघर बनीखेत, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश के मध्य नीचे दिये गये विषय पर औद्योगिक विवाद है ;

और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा-12(4) के अधीन समझौता अधिकारी द्वारा प्रस्तुत की गई रिपोर्ट पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा-12 की उप-धारा (5) के अधीन विचार करने के पश्चात् अधोहस्ताक्षरी ने निर्णय लिया है कि यह मामला श्रम न्यायालय को अधिनिर्णय के लिये भेजने योग्य है ;

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार द्वारा जारी अधिसूचना संख्या 19-8/89-श्रम(लूज), दिनांक 7 सितम्बर, 1992 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए अधोहस्ताक्षरी औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा-10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद्वारा इस मामले को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा-7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय, हिमाचल प्रदेश को नीचे व्याख्या किये गये विषय पर अधिनिर्णय देने के लिए भेजा जाता है :—

“कि क्या श्री सलीम मुपुत्र श्री रज्जाक, व्यवसाय मंसन को महाप्रबन्धक, जय प्रकाश एसोसियेट्स, चमेरा परियोजना, गांव छान्ना मोड़, डाकघर बनीखेत, जिला चम्बा, हिमाचल प्रदेश द्वारा, बिना किसी आरोप पत्र दिये व जांच किये नौकरी से निकालना सही व न्याय संगत है ? यदि नहीं तो कामगार श्री सलीम किस राहत एवं क्षतिपूर्ति का हकदार है।”

हस्ताक्षरित/-
श्रमसूचना

भाग 5—वैयक्तिक अधिसूचनाएं और विज्ञापन

In the Court of Shri V. K. Sharma, Additional District Judge, Sirmaur District at Nahan, Himachal Pradesh

Civil appeal No. 3-N/13 of 1992

1. Surjeet Singh *alias* Jeet Singh son of Shri Narian Singh, r/o village Taruwala, Tehsil Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh and 14 other appellants
..Appellants.

Versus

1. Shamsheer Singh son of Shri Bhanga Ram, resident of village Taruwala, Tehsil Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur, Himachal Pradesh and 7 other respondents.
..Respondents.

PROCLAMATION UNDER ORDER 5, RULE 20, C.P.C

To

6. Shrimati Chand Rani, w/o Shri Kumdan Lal, r/o village Garh Koti, Tehsil Kasauli, District Solan, Himachal Pradesh.
7. Arun Sharma s/o Shri Kumdan Lal, r/o village Garh Koti, Tehsil Kasauli, District Solan, Himachal Pradesh.
8. Shrimati Sunita w/o Shri Arun Sharma, r/o Garh Koti, Tehsil Kasauli, District Solan, Himachal Pradesh.

Whereas in the above noted case it has been proved to the satisfaction of this court that the above named respondents Nos. 6 to 8 can not be served through ordinary course of service, hence this proclamation U/o 5, rule 20 CPC is issued against the respondents No. 6 to 8 namely; Shrimati Chand Rani, Arun Sharma and Shrimati Sunita Sharma directing them to appear in this court personally or through their attorney or authorised agent on 6-3-1993 at 10 a. m. to defend the case, failing which the suit shall be heard and decided *ex parte*.

Given under my hand and seal of the court this 18th day of December, 1992.

Seal.

V. K. SHARMA,
Additional District Judge,
Sirmaur District at Nahan (H.P.).

In the Court of Shri V. K. Ahuja, Additional District Judge, Una Division at Una, Himachal Pradesh

Civil appeal No. 38/91.

Next date of 19-4-1993.

Tarsem Singh 2. Joginder Singh sons 3. Salochana Devi 4. Kaushlaya Devi d/o 5. Shrimati Kala Devi wd/o Pirthi Singh, r/o village Loharli, Tehsil Amb, District Una, Himachal Pradesh
..Applicants.

Versus

Des Raj 2. Multan Singh 3. Mansa Ram 4. Tersem Lal 5. Om Parkesh, sons, 6. Suphlan Devi wd/ 7. Chanchala Devi d/o Milkhi s/o Gonda *alias* Govinda r/o Loharli, Tehsil Amb, District Una, 8. Nanak Chand s/o Pirthi s/o Gonda, r/o village Loharli, Tehsil Amb.
..Respondents.

Nanak Chand s/o Pirthi s/o Gonda, r/o Village Loharli, Tehsil Amb, District Una, Himachal Pradesh.

Whereas in the above noted case, it has been proved to the satisfaction of this court and it appears that the above noted respondent can not be served in ordinary course of service, as they are evading the service of summons. Hence this proclamation under order 5, Rule 20 C.P.C. is issued against the above noted unserved respondent to appear in this court personally or through

an authorised agent or advocate to defend their case on 19-4-1993 at 10 a. m. failing to which the case will be heard and decided *ex parte*.

Given under my hand and seal of this court on this 23rd day of December, 1992.

Seal.

V. K. AHUJA,
Additional District Judge,
Una, Division at Una H.P.

व अदालत सीनियर सब-जज महोदय, कुल्लू, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0)

पटीशन नं0 20/92

1. देवेन्द्र सिंह, 2. सुरेन्द्र सिंह, 3. वीरेन्द्र सिंह उर्फ भादर सिंह, 4. किरन सिंह पुत्रगण मोहर सिंह ठाकुर, निवासी लरा केलो फाटी नयान, कोठी नगर, तहसील व जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0), 5. हिमदासी विधवा मोहर सिंह, निवासी लरा केलो, फाटी नयान, कोठी नगर, तहसील व जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0) ..प्रार्थीगण ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

..प्रत्यार्थीगण ।

उपरोक्त उनकान पटीशन में प्रार्थीगण ने भारतीय उत्तराधि-कार नियम 372 के तहत गुजारी है । ग्राम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि प्रार्थीगण मृतक मोहर सिंह ठाकुर पुत्र चंदे राम जाकि 26-6-92 को स्वर्णवास हो चुका है । का उत्तराधिकार प्रमाण-पत्र लेना चाहते हैं । यदि इस बारे में किसी को एतराज हो तो तिथि 27-2-1993 को सुबह 10.00 बजे अमालनन या वकालतन हाजिर हो कर पैरवी करें अन्यथा एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमन में लाई जावेगी ।

मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत में जारी हुआ ।

मोहर ।

हस्ताक्षरित/-

सीनियर सब-जज,

कुल्लू, जिला कुल्लू (हि0 प्र0) ।

व अदालत श्री जे0एन0 वारोवानिया, सीनियर सब-जज मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

दरखास्त नं0 11/92

हरष कुमार पुत्र मृतक श्री ओम प्रकाश, 2. अंजली पुत्री मृतक श्री ओम प्रकाश, 3. आरती पुत्री मृतक श्री ओम प्रकाश, 4. श्रीमती भीना देवी विधवा मृतक श्री ओम प्रकाश, 5. कृष्णा बिष्ट पुत्री श्रीमती पारवती देवी, 6. सुभाष मलहोत्रा पुत्री पार्वती देवी, निवासी मकान नं0 170/4, पेलिस रोड, मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश ..प्रार्थीगण ।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

..प्रत्यार्थीगण ।

दरखास्त जेर धारा 372 आफ इन्डियन सर्वेसेशन ऐक्ट बराये लेने सर्वेसन सर्टीफिकेट ।

बनाम:

ग्राम जनता

उपरोक्त मुकदमा में प्रार्थीगण ने एक दरखास्त जेर धारा 372 आफ इन्डियन सर्वेसेशन ऐक्ट के अधीन इस अदालत में बराये लेने सर्वेसन सर्टीफिकेट फारम का 432 नं0 ग्राम हिस्सा (ordinary share) का आई0टी0सी0लिमिटेड जारी किया जावे । अतः ग्राम जनता व मृतक श्रीमती पार्वती देवी क तमाम रिश्तेदारों को ईशतहार जारी करके सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त हिस्सा बारा का सर्वेसन सर्टीफिकेट प्रार्थीगण क हक में जारी करने में कोई उजर हो तो वे दिनांक 27-2-93 बक्कत 10.00 बजे हाजर अदालत आकर

अपने उजरात पेश कर सकते हैं। वसूरेत दीगर कार्यवाही एक तरफा जाब्ता अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 23 दिसम्बर, 1992 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत में जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

जे० एन० वारोवालिया
सीनियर सब-जज,
मण्डी (हि० प्र०)।

व अदालत श्री एम० सी० कैथ्या, सब-जज प्रथम श्रेणी, करसोग
मुकाम मुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मुकद्मा नं० 207 आफ 1990, 153 आफ 1991

ईण्डियन ओवरसीज बैंक, मुन्दरनगर ब्रांच, व हरिया ब्रांच मैनेजर
वादी।

बनाम

1. तुता राम, 2. पुरन चन्द, 3. प्रेम सिंह उर्फ प्रेम चन्द पुत्रगण
नानक चन्द, 4. फूलमू देवी, 5. कनकू देवी विधवा नानक चन्द, 6. श्रीमती
कृष्णी, 7. भोली, 8. गान्ती, 9. गीता, 10. पारवती, 11. शीला पुत्रगण
नानक चन्द पुत्र जिन्दू राम, मकना गांव कमरला, डाकखाना पेंडी,
तहसील मुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश, सन राम पुत्र जगत
मकना जीरा, डाकखाना महादेव, तहसील मुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी,
हिमाचल प्रदेश
प्रतिवादीगण।

दावा वसूली मुकद्मा 5364/- रुपये

उपरोक्त मुकद्मा उनवान वाला में इस अदालत को पूर्ण विश्वास
हो चुका है कि उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण नं० 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
व 11 की तामील साधारण तरीके से होता सम्भव है।
अतः उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण नं० 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 व 11
के नाम इस्तहार जेर आर्डर 5, रू० 20, सी० पी० सी० जारी
करके सूचित किया जाता है कि वे दिनांक 16-2-1993 बजे 10 बजे
मुकाम मुन्दरनगर इस अदालत हजा में अमालतन व वकालतन उपरोक्त
मुकद्मा की पेरवी करें। वसूरेत दीगर कार्यवाही जाब्ता अमल
में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 18 दिसम्बर, 1992 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर
अदालत में जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

एम० सी० कैथ्या,
सब-जज प्रथम श्रेणी, करसोग
मुकाम मुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी।

व अदालत जनाब श्री मनोज कुमार, उप-मण्डल अधिकारी (ना) देहरा
जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)

शिव राज सिंह बनाम जगदीप सिंह डटवाल आदि

निर्वाचन याचिका संख्या 21/1992

नोटिस बनाम:

1. मस्तान सिंह पुत्र नन्द लाल। निवासी चुयरेहड, मौजा, सन्हेत
2. बरटू राम पुत्र चूहड़ू राम। तहसील देहरा।
3. पंजाब सिंह पुत्र भगत राम, निवासी भंगई, मौजा सन्हेत, तहसील देहरा।

बमुकद्मा उपरोक्त में आप की तामील न हो रही है तथा
मुकद्मा काफी समय से लम्बित चला आ रहा है जिसका निर्णय
किया जाना जरूरी है। अतः आप को इस नोटिस के द्वारा सूचित
किया जाता है कि आप जहां कहीं भी हों हमारे समक्ष मुकद्मा की

पेरवी हेतु स्वयं अथवा वकील द्वारा दिनांक 22-2-93 प्रातः 10.00
बजे हाजर आवें। हाजर न आने की दशा में आपके विश्व कार्य-
वाही एकतरफा करके मुकद्मा का निर्णय कर दिया जावेगा।

आज दिनांक 21-12-92 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत
से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

मनोज कुमार,
उप-मण्डल अधिकारी (ना),
देहरा।

व अदालत श्री बाल कृष्ण शर्मा, उप-मण्डल मैजिस्ट्रेट, करसोग,
जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री हरी सिंह पुत्र श्री हेत राम, निवासी ममेल, इलाका कजौण,
तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी, हिमाचल प्रदेश
प्रार्थी।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखवास्त जेर धारा 13(3) पंजीकरण जन्म व मृत्यु।

उपरोक्त मुकद्मा उनवाल वाला में श्री हरी सिंह पुत्र श्री हेत राम,
निवासी ममेल, इलाका कजौण, तहसील करसोग, जिला मण्डी,
हिमाचल प्रदेश ने इस कार्यालय में आवेदन-पत्र दिया है कि
उसका पुत्र नन्द लाल को उसकी पत्नी सावित्री पुत्री हुकमिया राम,
निवासी तवां, इलाका अपर करसोग के विवाह सम्बन्ध से 20 मई,
1989 को पैदा हुआ है स्वयं घर से बाहर रहने के कारण उसकी
जन्म तिथि पंचायत रिकार्ड ग्राम पंचायत, ममेल में पंजीकृत नहीं
हुई है।

अतः ग्राम जनता को बजरिया इस्तहार सूचित किया जाता है
कि उपरोक्त पंजीकरण द्वारा किसी का कोई उजर व एतराज हो
तो वह दिनांक 9-2-1993 को अमालतन व वकालतन इस कार्यालय
में प्रातः 10 बजे हाजर हों तब आपने उजर पेश करें अन्यथा
दिगर कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 26-12-92 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से
जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

बाल कृष्ण शर्मा,
उप-मण्डल मैजिस्ट्रेट, करसोग,
जिला मण्डी (हि० प्र०)।

इस्तहार

न्यायालय श्री ठाकुर जय सिंह, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी एवम
उप-रजिस्ट्रार, आनी जिला कुल्लू (हि० प्र०)

व मुकद्मा :-

श्री वीर सिंह पुत्र श्री मेहर दास, गांव गुंजी, फाटी
विगुल, कोठी सीरीगढ़, तहसील आनी, जिला कुल्लू
प्रार्थी।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखवास्त जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवम मृत्यु पंजीकरण
एक्ट, 1969.

श्री वीर सिंह पुत्र मेहर दास, गांव गुंजी, फाटी विगुल, तहसील
आनी ने इस कार्यालय में निवेदन किया है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि
17-5-1975 है तथा उसकी जन्म तिथि का इन्दाज गलत किया
गया है।

अतः ग्राम जनता को इस इस्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है
कि इस द्वारा अगर किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर व एतराज आदि हो

तो वह दिनांक 30-1-93 को समय 10 बजे प्रातः अमानतन या वकालतन इस न्यायालय को पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एक पक्षीय कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 30-12-92 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर तथा मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

ठाकुर जय सिंह,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
उप-तहसील आनी,
जिला कुल्लू (हि० प्र०)।

इशतहार

न्यायालय ठाकुर जय सिंह, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, आनी,
जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश

दावा

मिसल नं० 6/92 तारीख पेशी 30-1-93

उन्वान मुकद्दमा :-

सुरेश सिंह वजरिया मलकीत सिंह पुत्र महेन्द्र सिंह मुख्तार ग्राम, गांव जोह, फाटी मांझादेश, तहसील आनी, जिला कुल्लू ..प्रार्थी।

बनाम

सुरेश कुमार पुत्र राम मोहन लाल, गांव जोह, फाटी मांझादेश, तहसील आनी, जिला कुल्लू ..प्रत्यार्थी।

दरखास्त दस्तुती इन्द्राज भूमि खेवट/खतोनी नं० 446 मिन/495 कित्ता 3, रकबा 6-19 बीघा, बाक्या फाटी मांझादेश।

मुकद्दमा उपरोक्त में प्रार्थी ने इस अदालत को दरखास्त दी है कि उपरोक्त आराजी के निस्वत प्रत्यार्थी की काश का गलत इन्द्राज किया गया है। इस बारे प्रत्यार्थी पर साधारण तरीके से तामील नहीं हो पा रही है। अतः प्रत्यार्थी को इस राजपत्र इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह दिनांक 30-1-93 को प्रातः 10 बजे अमानतन या वकालतन न्यायालय में आकर मुकद्दमा की पैरवी करें। हाजर न आने की सूरत में हल्व जावता कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 29-12-92 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर तथा मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

ठाकुर जय सिंह,
सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय श्रेणी,
उप-तहसील आनी, जिला कुल्लू।

इशतहार

न्यायालय ठाकुर जय सिंह, सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय श्रेणी,
उप-तहसील आनी, जिला कुल्लू, हिमाचल प्रदेश

दावा दस्तुती इन्द्राज मिसल नं० 7/92, तारीख पेशी 30-1-1993
उन्वान मुकद्दमा :-

सुरेश सिंह वजरिया मलकीयत सिंह पुत्र महेन्द्र सिंह, मुख्तार ग्राम गांव जोह, फाटी मांझादेश, तहसील आनी, जिला कुल्लू ..प्रार्थी।

बनाम

सुरेश कुमार पुत्र राम मोहन लाल, गांव जोह, फाटी मांझादेश, तहसील आनी, जिला कुल्लू ..प्रत्यार्थी।

दरखास्त दस्तुती काश भूमि खेवट/खतोनी नं० 492/490, खमरा नं० 325 रकबा 0/19 बीघा तथा खेवट/खतोनी नं० 443/491, खमरा नं० 330, रकबा 2-0 बीघा, बाक्या फाटी शिल्ली, कोठी जांवा, तहसील आनी।

मुकद्दमा उपरोक्त में प्रार्थी ने इस अदालत को दरखास्त दी है कि उपरोक्त आराजी के निस्वत काश का गलत इन्द्राज किया गया है। इस बारे प्रत्यार्थी की तामील साधारण तरीके से नहीं हो पा रही है। अतः प्रत्यार्थी को इस राजपत्र इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह दिनांक 30-1-93 को प्रातः 10 बजे अमानतन या वकालतन हाजर आकर मुकद्दमा की पैरवी करें। हाजर न आने की सूरत में हल्व जावता कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 29-12-92 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर तथा मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

ठाकुर जय सिंह,
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
उप-तहसील आनी, जिला कुल्लू।

व अदालत जनाब श्री सुरिन्द्र कुमार, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, फतेहपुर,
जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

प्रमोद सिंह

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

मिसल नं० 89/1992/एन.टी.एफ.

तारीख पेशी 1-2-1993

किसम मुकद्दमा जन्म पंजीयन

श्री प्रमोद सिंह पुत्र गंगा राम, निवामी मांच, मांजा तंगल, उप-तहसील फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश ..प्रार्थी।

ग्राम जनता

ग्राम जनता

..प्रतिवादी।

दरखास्त बराबे जन्म पंजीयन जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीयन अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र दाखल किया है कि उसके पुत्र तिलोक सिंह का जन्म दिनांक 15-11-86 को गांव मोच, मांजा तंगल, उप-तहसील फतेहपुर में हुआ था मगर वह अज्ञानता से उसकी जन्म तिथि पंचायत में पंजीकृत नहीं करवा सका।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उक्त बच्चे के जन्म पंजीयन बारे किसी व्यक्ति को कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 1-2-1993 को प्रातः 10-00 बजे अमानतन या वकालतन हाजर अदालत आकर अपना एतराज पेश करे अन्यथा जन्म पंजीयन आदेश वहक ग्राम पंचायत तंगल को जारी कर दिया जायेगा।

यह इशतहार आज दिनांक 22-12-92 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

सुरिन्द्र कुमार,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा।

व अदालत जनाब सुरिन्द्र कुमार, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्रीमती लज्जा देवी

बनाम

ग्राम जनता।

मिसल नं० 88/1992/NTF

तारीख पेशी 1-2-1993

किसम मुकद्दमा जन्म पंजीयन

श्रीमती लज्जा देवी पत्नी श्री जगदीश चन्द, निवासी धमेटा, उप-तहसील फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश प्राथिया।

ब अदालत जनाब सुरिन्द्र कुमार, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

बनाम
ग्राम जनता
प्रतिवादी।
दख्खास्त बराये जन्म पंजीयन जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीयन अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त प्राथिया ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र दायर किया है कि उसके सुपुत्र सोहन लाल का जन्म दिनांक 14-1-1986 को गांव धमेटा में हुआ था, मगर प्रार्थिया उसकी जन्म तिथि पंचायत में अज्ञानता से पंजीकृत नहीं करवा सकी।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा सर्व साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उक्त बच्चे के जन्म पंजीयन बारे किसी व्यक्ति को कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 1-2-1993 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन हाजर अदालत आकर अपना एतराज पेश करे अन्यथा जन्म पंजीयन आदेश बहक ग्राम पंचायत धमेटा को जारी कर दिये जायेंगे।

यह इशतहार आज दिनांक 22-12-1992 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर। सुरिन्द्र कुमार,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि 0 प्र 0)।

ब अदालत जनाब सुरिन्द्र कुमार, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्रीमती लज्जा देवी बनाम ग्राम जनता।
मिसल नं० 87/1992/N.T.F. तारीख पेशी 1-2-1993 किस्म मुकद्दमा जन्म एवं मृत्यु अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत जन्म पंजीयन।

श्रीमती लज्जा देवी पत्नी श्री जगदीश चन्द, निवासी धमेटा, उप-तहसील फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश प्राथिया।

बनाम
ग्राम जनता
प्रतिवादी।
दख्खास्त बराये जन्म पंजीयन जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त प्राथिया ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र दायर किया है कि उसके सुपुत्र अरविन्द कुमार का जन्म दिनांक 18-10-1988 को गांव धमेटा, उप-तहसील फतेहपुर में हुआ था मगर वह उसकी जन्म तिथि पंचायत में दर्ज नहीं करवा सकी।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा सर्व साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उपरोक्त बच्चे की जन्म तिथि पंजीकृत करने बारे किसी व्यक्ति को कोई एतराज हो तो वह अपना एतराज असालतन या वकालतन हाजर अदालत आकर दिनांक 1-2-1993 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे पेश करे, अन्यथा जन्म पंजीयन आदेश बहक ग्राम पंचायत धमेटा को जारी कर दिये जायेंगे।

यह इशतहार आज दिनांक 22-12-1992 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर। सुरिन्द्र कुमार,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि 0 प्र 0)।

आत्मा राम बनाम ग्राम जनता।
मिसल नं० 90/1992/N.T.F. तारीख पेशी 1-2-1993 किस्म मुकद्दमा जन्म पंजीयन

श्री आत्मा राम पुत्र दयालू राम, निवासी दयाल, डाकघर धमेटा, उप-तहसील फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा प्राथी।

बनाम
ग्राम जनता

दख्खास्त बराये जन्म पंजीयन जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीयन अधिनियम, 1969।

उपरोक्त प्राथी ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र दायर किया है कि उसके पुत्र उत्तवंत सिंह का जन्म दिनांक 9-12-1988 को गांव दयाल, उप-तहसील फतेहपुर में हुआ था मगर वह उसकी जन्म तिथि अज्ञानता से पंचायत में पंजीकृत नहीं करवा सका।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि उक्त बच्चे के जन्म पंजीयन बारे किसी व्यक्ति को कोई एतराज हो तो वह अपना एतराज असालतन या वकालतन हाजर अदालत आकर दिनांक 1-2-1993 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे पेश करे, अन्यथा जन्म पंजीयन आदेश बहक ग्राम पंचायत बाड़ी जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

यह इशतहार आज दिनांक 22-12-1992 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर। सुरिन्द्र कुमार,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
फतेहपुर, कांगड़ा।

ब अदालत जनाब सुरिन्द्र कुमार, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

आत्मा राम बनाम ग्राम जनता।
मिसल नं० 91/1992/N.T.F. पेशी तारीख 1-2-1993 किस्म मुकद्दमा जन्म पंजीयन

श्री आत्मा राम पुत्र दयालू राम, निवासी दयाल, मौजा बाड़ी, उप-तहसील फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा प्राथी।

बनाम
ग्राम जनता प्रतिवादी

दख्खास्त बराये जन्म पंजीयन जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीयन अधिनियम, 1969.

उपरोक्त प्राथी ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र दायर किया है कि उसके पुत्र जयपाल का जन्म दिनांक 17-4-1990 को गांव दयाल, मौजा बाड़ी, उप-तहसील फतेहपुर में हुआ था मगर वह अज्ञानता से उसकी जन्म तिथि पंचायत में पंजीकृत नहीं करवा सका।

अतः इस इशतहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त बच्चे के जन्म पंजीयन बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 1-2-1993 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन हाजर अदालत आकर अपना एतराज पेश करे अन्यथा जन्म पंजीयन आदेश बहक ग्राम पंचायत बाड़ी जारी कर दिए जाएंगे।

वह इस्तहार आज दिनांक 22-12-1992 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत में जमा किया गया।

मोहर।
मुक्ति कृष्ण,
कार्यवाही दण्डाधिकारी,
फतेहपुर, कांगड़ा।

व अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकदमा जगीर सिंह पुत्र बलीप सिंह, गांव नंगल, डा 0 बीहण, तहसील देहरा, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर द्वारा 12(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

श्री जगीर सिंह ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त दी है कि उसकी पुत्री रंजु देवी का जन्म पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया गया है अब दर्ज किया जाय। उसकी पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 23-4-1984 है तथा बच्चे का जन्म गांव नंगल में हुआ था।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को इसका नाम दर्ज करने वाले आपत्ति या उजर हो तो वह दिनांक 29-1-1993 समय 10 बजे प्रातः स्वयं या किसी वान्छित को माध्यम से हमारे समक्ष अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश करें अन्यथा एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 24-12-1992 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।
हस्ताक्षरित/-
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
देहरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि 0 प्र 0)

व अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील देहरा, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

व मुकदमा मलकीयत सिंह पुत्र सलत राम, गांव घियारी, तहसील देहरा, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर द्वारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

श्री मलकीयत सिंह ने इस न्यायालय में दरखास्त दी है कि उसकी पुत्री अनुराधा का जन्म पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया गया है अब दर्ज किया जाए। उसकी पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 11-7-1984 है तथा बच्चे का जन्म गांव नंगल घियारी में हुआ था।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को इसका नाम दर्ज करवाने वाले कोई आपत्ति या उजर हो तो वह दिनांक 29-1-1993 समय 10 बजे प्रातः स्वयं अथवा किसी वान्छित को माध्यम से हमारे समक्ष अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश करें अन्यथा एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 24-12-1992 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
देहरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि 0 प्र 0)

व अदालत कार्यकारी अधिकारी, तहसील देहरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि 0 प्र 0)

व मुकदमा श्रीमती मनमरी देवी विधवा चौधरी राम, गांव डोली, डाकघर कयोम, तहसील देहरा, जिला कांगड़ा, हि 0 प्र 0।

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर द्वारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु अधिनियम 1969.

नोटिस बनाम जनता।

श्रीमती मनमरी देवी ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त दी है कि उसके पति श्री चौधरी राम की मृत्यु तिथि पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाई गई है अब दर्ज की जाये। उसका पति की मृत्यु 9-12-1991 को हुई थी।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उसकी मृत्यु तिथि दर्ज करने वाले कोई आपत्ति या उजर हो तो वह दिनांक 29-1-1993 समय 10 बजे प्रातः स्वयं अथवा किसी वान्छित माध्यम से हमारे समक्ष अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश करें अन्यथा एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जायेगी।

आज दिनांक 24-12-1992 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।
हस्ताक्षरित/-
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी देहरा,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि 0 प्र 0)

व अदालत कार्यकारी अधिकारी, तहसील देहरा, जिला कांगड़ा, हि 0 प्र 0

व मुकदमा श्री हंस राज पुत्र तोतु राम, गांव नंगल, डा 0 बीहण, तहसील देहरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि 0 प्र 0)

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त जेर द्वारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु अधिनियम, 1969.

नोटिस बनाम जनता।

श्री हंस राज ने इस अदालत में दरखास्त दी है कि उसकी पुत्री कुसम लता का जन्म पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज नहीं करवाया है अब दर्ज किया जाए। उसकी पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 10-10-1984 है तथा बच्चे का जन्म गांव नंगल में हुआ है।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को इसका नाम दर्ज करने वाले कोई आपत्ति या उजर हो तो वह दिनांक 29-1-1993

समय 10 बजे प्रातः स्वयं, अथवा किसी वांछित माध्यम से हमारे समक्ष अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश करें अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्य-वाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 24-12-92 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
देहरा, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री यशोधन सिंह ठाकुर, मध-रजिस्ट्रार, घुमारवीं
जिला बिलासपुर हि० प्र०

मिलम नं० 16/90

ब मुकद्दमा प्रेम लाल, फूला देवी बनाम ग्राम जनता

दरखास्त वाक्य किये जाने तत्पश्चात् वसीयत नामा मुतवफी सुख राम पुत्र वीणू राम, मौजा श्रीहर, परगना त्यून, तहसील घुमारवीं, जिला बिलासपुर, हि० प्र०।

अधीन धारा 40/41 भारतीय रजिस्ट्रेशन ऐक्ट

सर्वसाधारण जनता को बजरिया राजपत्र इशतहार सूचित किया जाता है कि श्री प्रेम लाल पुत्र सुख राम व मु० फूला देवी बनाम सुख राम, गांव श्रीहर ने एक दरखास्त दिनांक 5-10-92 को बराये तमदीक वसीयत नामा मुतवफी श्री सुख राम पुत्र वीणू राम, गांव श्रीहर (पनह) परगना त्यून, तहसील घुमारवीं दिनांक 31-7-90 जारी रखी है। जिसकी तारीख पेशी दिनांक 29-1-93 को निश्चित है। अगर किसी व्यक्ति को इस वसीयत के तमदीक किये जाने में कोई उजर/एतराज तो दिनांक 29-1-93 को अपना उजर/एतराज हाजिर अदालत आकर पेश कर सकता है। वसूरत बाद मुजरने तारीख पेशी उपरोक्त कोई उजर/एतराज आवले समाप्त नहीं होगा और वसीयत की रजिस्ट्रेशन जर धारा 40/41 भारतीय रजिस्ट्रेशन ऐक्ट कर दी जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 24-12-92 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

यशोधन सिंह ठाकुर,
मध-रजिस्ट्रार,
घुमारवीं, जिला बिलासपुर (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री यशोधन सिंह ठाकुर, सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय श्रेणी
(नायब तहसीलदार), घुमारवीं, जिला बिलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मिलम नं०

तारीख मरजग्रा

62/9

1-12-90

दरखास्त जर धारा 123, हिमाचल प्रदेश भू० राजस्व अधिनियम, वाक्य तकसीम भूमि खाना नं० 30, खतीनी नं० 32, 33, 34, 35, खमरा नं० 315, 344 मिन, 344 मिन, 342, रकबा तादादी 13-19 बांघा, वाक्या मौजा टकरेड़ा, तहसील घुमारवीं, जिला बिलासपुर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

ब मुकद्दमा:-

दरपत्नी देवी विधवा मरखू राम, गांव टकरेड़ा, परगना त्यून, तहसील घुमारवीं

बनाम

1. दुल्हा सुपुत्र, 2. राम लाल सुपुत्र रामजी, गांव टकरेड़ा, पर० त्यून, तहसील घुमारवीं, 3. शंकर सुपुत्र किन्नु, 4. शंकर विधवा किन्नु, गांव टकरेड़ा, पर० त्यून, तहसील घुमारवीं, 5. अछरी पत्नी शिव राम, गांव घुमारवीं (बल्ह), 6. हरदेई पत्नी सुन्दर राम, गांव

चलैली, पर० सपूत, 7. मथरा देवी पत्नी दुर्गा राम, गांव टिकरी, पर० त्यून, 8. शिवदेई पत्नी अमर नाथ गांव घुमारवीं (बल्ह), 9. गलाबी पत्नी प्रभोत्तम, गांव घुमारवीं (बल्ह), 10. किरण सुपुत्र रामजी, गांव टकरेड़ा, तहसील घुमारवीं, 11. सुका सुपुत्र श्री रामजी, गांव टकरेड़ा, तहसील घुमारवीं

प्रतिवादी।

उपरोक्त मिसल बराये किये जाने तरीका तकसीम भूमि, हमारे समक्ष दिनांक 28-1-91 को पेश हुई है। मिसल हज्जामें सभी प्रतिवादीगणों को समन कई बार हाजिर अदालत होने के लिए जारी हुए लेकिन उनकी तामील जाब्ता साधारण तरीके से नहीं हो पा रही है। इसलिए आदेश 5, नियम 20, सी० पी० सी० के अधीन इस अदालती सूचना/इशतहार द्वारा एक बार फिर सभी प्रतिवादीगणों को सूचित किया जाता है कि वे मिति 29-1-93 को प्रातः 10 बजे अदालत या वकालत हाजिर अदालत आकर उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा की पैरवी करें अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 24-12-92 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

यशोधन सिंह ठाकुर,
(सहायक समाहर्ता) द्वितीय श्रेणी,
नायब तहसीलदार घुमारवीं,
जिला बिलासपुर (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री लछमण दास ठाकुर, नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी
दण्डाधिकारी, जयसिंहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)

मुकद्दमा नं० तारीख पेशी किसम मुकद्दमा

338/92 27-2-1993 मृत्यु तिथि पंजीकरण

ब मुकद्दमा:

श्रीमती कांता देवी पत्नी प्रधान सिंह, निवासी गांव सरी, डाक-घर मोलन, ग्राम पंचायत सरी, मौजा जयसिंहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, (हि० प्र०)

बनाम

ग्राम जनता

प्रतिवादी।

विषय:-दरखास्त जर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 बराये मृत्यु पंजीकरण श्री प्रधान सिंह पुत्र श्री गोरख राम, निवासी मुहल, सरी, ग्राम पंचायत सरी, डाकघर मोलन, मौजा व तहसील जयसिंहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)।

उपरोक्त प्रार्थी ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना-पत्र बराये मृत्यु पंजीकरण गुजारा है कि उसके पति श्री प्रधान सिंह की मृत्यु दिनांक 7-12-1992 को गांव सरी, डा० मोलन, मौजा व तहसील जयसिंहपुर जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०) में हुई थी परन्तु श्री प्रधान सिंह पुत्रक जो कि प्रार्थिया श्रीमती कांता देवी के पति हैं की मृत्यु तिथि दिनांक 7-12-1992 को उनकी ग्राम पंचायत सरी में समक्ष पर पंजीकृत नहीं करवा सकी। अतः अब प्रार्थिया के पति श्री प्रधान सिंह मजकूर की मृत्यु तिथि 7-12-1992 को उनकी ग्राम पंचायत सरी में पंजीकृत करने की स्वीकृति प्रदान की जाये।

अतः सर्व साधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस मृत्यु-पंजीकरण बारे किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर वा एतराज हो तो दिनांक 27-2-1993 को सुबह 10.00 बजे हाजिर अदालत आकर एतराज पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा उपरोक्त व्यक्ति की मृत्यु तिथि दिनांक 7-12-1992 बारे आदेश दे दिए जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 30-12-92 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

लछमण दास ठाकुर,
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
जयसिंहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि० प्र०)।

ब अदालत श्री लछमण दास ठाकुर, नाथव तहसीलदार एवं महायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, जयसिंहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)

मुकद्दमा नम्बर तारीख पेशी किसम मुकद्दमा
18/एन/92 10-2-1993 तकसीम भूमि

प्रमदास पुत्र श्री कशमीर, निवासी महाल व मौजा लाहट, तहसील जयसिंहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश . . प्रार्थी।

बनाम

1. मोहन लाल पुत्र कशमीर, 2. शम्भू राम, 3. जसवन्त सिंह पुत्रान सुदासा, 4. सेवती देवी विधवा, 5. हरी सिंह, 6. ज्योति प्रकाश, 7. शम्भू कुमार पुत्रान व, 8. श्रीमती कुन्डला देवी, (पत्नी पुरपोतम तथा) पुत्री शम्भू राम, 9. श्रीमती रेशा देवी पुत्री, 10. कुमारी सुभद्रा पुत्री, 11. रक्षा देवी पुत्री, 12. अशोक कुमार पुत्र श्री मोहर राम, 13. गंगा राम पुत्र, 14. श्रीमती मथा देवी पुत्र चढतू राम, 15. फतेह सिंह, 16. आत्मा राम, पुत्रान, 17. काम्ता देवी, सुदर्शना देवी पुत्रिया श्रीमती सोनी देवी पुत्री चढतू राम, निवासी महाल डिहब/लाहट/गुग्गा, मौजा लाहट, तहसील जयसिंहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0) . . प्रतिवादीगण।

विषय:-तकसीम भूमि खाता नं0 104, खतौनी नं0 182, खसरा किता 11 एकवा तादादी 0-31-14 हेक्टेयर बाक्या महाल डिहब, मौजा लाहट, तहसील जयसिंहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

उपरोक्त विषय के सम्बन्ध में उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा उनवान फरीकन दोयम को कई बार समन जारी किये गये परन्तु आसाल तरीक से प्रतिवादियों पर समनों की तामील नहीं हो पा रही है। अतः प्रतिवादियों को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वे दिनांक 10-2-1993 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत हुआ में आसालतन या बकालतन हाजिर होकर परबो मुकद्दमा करें। अन्यथा उनके विरुद्ध एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 23-12-1992 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी हुआ।

लछमण दास ठाकुर,
नाथव तहसीलदार एवं महायक समाहर्ता,
द्वितीय श्रेणी, जयसिंहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री लछमण दास ठाकुर, नाथव तहसीलदार एवं महायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, जयसिंहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)

मुकद्दमा नम्बर तारीख पेशी किसम मुकद्दमा
20/एन/1992 10-2-93 तकसीम भूमि

संजय कुमार पुत्र जगदीश चन्द, 2. समिता कुमारी विधवा निंदर चन्द पुत्र जगदीश, 3. कुशमलता पत्नी राजिन्दर कुमार पुत्र कशमीर सिंह, निवासी महाल टिकरी, मौजा व तहसील जयसिंहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा हिमाचल प्रदेश . . प्रार्थी।

बनाम

केदार नाथ पुत्र नाथक चन्द, 2. सुशीला देवी पुत्री परसिया पुत्र काहन, निवासी महाल टिकरी, मौजा व तहसील जयसिंहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश . . प्रतिवादीगण

विषय:-तकसीम भूमि खाता नं0 192, खतौनी नं0 366, खसरा नं0 466 व 467, किता 2, एकवा तादादी 0 09-70 हेक्टेयर, बाक्या महाल टिकरी, मौजा व तहसील जयसिंहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

उपरोक्त विषय के सम्बन्ध में उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा उनवान फरीकन दोयम को कई बार समन जारी किये गये परन्तु आसाल तरीक से प्रतिवादियों पर समनों की तामील नहीं हो पा रही है। अतः प्रतिवादियों को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वे दिनांक 10-2-1993 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत हुआ में आसालतन या बकालतन हाजिर होकर परबो मुकद्दमा करें। अन्यथा उनके विरुद्ध एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 23-12-1992 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी हुआ।

लछमण दास ठाकुर,
नाथव तहसीलदार एवं महायक समाहर्ता,
द्वितीय श्रेणी, जयसिंहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत श्री मालीग्राम शर्मा तहसीलदार/महायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, कांगड़ा, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्री राम स्वरूप पुत्र गीणू राम, वासी महाल जमानाबाद।

बनाम

श्रीमती कृष्णा देवी, विमला देवी, मुदर्शना देवी, चन्द्र काल्ता, पुत्रिया मानक चन्द, भगवान दास, राम प्रकाश पुत्र व श्रीमती दानावती विधवा राम रखा, वासी जमानाबाद, तहसील कांगड़ा।

दरखास्त दस्तख्त इन्द्राज भूमि खाता नम्बर 15, खतौनी नम्बर 46, नम्बरान खसरा 909, 910, 911 किता 3, तादादी 0-00-92 हेक्टेयर महाल जमानाबाद।

नोटिस

उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण को कई बार साधारण तरीका द्वारा इनलाह दी गई कि मुकद्दमा हुआ में आकर परबो करें परन्तु प्रतिवादीगण साधारण तरीका से तामीन करने में आना-कानी कर रहे हैं। अतः वारिया इशतहार द्वारा प्रतिवादीगण को सूचित किया जाता है कि वह दिनांक 4-2-93 को प्रातः 10 बजे हमारी अदालत में आसालतन या बकालतन हाजिर आकर मुकद्दमा की परबो करें। हाजिर न आने की सूचना में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 28-12-92 को मोहर अदालत व हस्ताक्षर द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर। मालीग्राम शर्मा,
तहसीलदार/महायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम श्रेणी, कांगड़ा,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री अमरनाथ शर्मा, महायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, पावटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश

उनवान मुहम्मद:-श्री छितर सिंह, भलखान सिंह, पूर्ण सिंह पुत्र प्रभु निवासी पातलीयाँ, तहसील पावटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश . . राहितान।

बनाम

श्री राम दास पुत्र ईशवर चन्द, निवासी पातलीयाँ, तहसील पावटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर हिमाचल प्रदेश मुरतहीन

विषय:-तसदीक इस्तकाल नम्बर 774 फकल रहत दिनांक 15-10-1992 खाता/खतौनी नम्बर 52/121 खतग नम्बर 11/2 एकवा तादादी 6-13 बीघा, मौजा पातलीयाँ तहसील पावटा साहिब, जिला सिरमौर, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

उपरोक्त इस्तकाल काफी अरसा से बराये तसदीक व फैसला में चला आ रहा है। मुरतहीन की तामील साधारण तरीका से नहीं हो रही है। अतः इस ईशतहार राजपत्र द्वारा मुरतहीन उपरोक्त श्री राम दास मुरतहीन को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि आप को कोई उजर या एतराज उपरोक्त इस्तकाल को तसदीक व फैसला होने में हो तो वह हमारे कार्यालय मुकान पुरुवाला तहसील पावटा साहिब तिथि 1-3-1993 को आसालतन या बकालतन हाजिर आकर परबो करें। अन्यथा एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी। वाद में कोई उजर व एतराज काबले समाप्त न होगा।

आज दिनांक 29-12-1992 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। अमरनाथ शर्मा,
महायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
पावटा साहिब।

व अदालत श्री प्यार चन्द वाहड़ी, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, रक्कड़,
जिला कांगड़ा (हिमाचल प्रदेश)

व अदालत श्री प्यार चन्द वाहड़ी, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, रक्कड़,
जिला कांगड़ा (हिमाचल प्रदेश)

श्री रमोना राम, निवासी कूहना, सब-तहसील रक्कड़

श्री सुरिन्द्र कुमारी, निवासी कूहना, सब-तहसील रक्कड़।

बनाम

बनाम

आम जनता

आम जनता

दख्खास्त जेर धारा 13(3) पंजीकरण जन्म व मृत्यु।

दख्खास्त जेर धारा 13(3) पंजीकरण जन्म व मृत्यु।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा उनवान वाला में प्रार्थी रसीला राम, निवासी कूहना, सब-तहसील रक्कड़ ने इस कार्यालय में गुजारिश की है कि उसके लड़के अनिल कुमार का जन्म पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज ना करवाया गया है अब दर्ज किया जाये। उसके पुत्र की जन्म तिथि 25-11-85 है तथा बच्चे का जन्म गांव कूहना में हुआ है।

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा उनवान वाला में प्रार्थी सुरिन्द्र कुमारी, निवासी कूहना, सब-तहसील रक्कड़ ने इस कार्यालय में गुजारिश की है कि उसकी पुत्री सुषमा देवी का जन्म पंचायत रजिस्टर में गलती से दर्ज न करवाया गया है अब दर्ज किया जावे। उसकी पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 30-11-1986 है तथा बच्चे का जन्म गांव कूहना में हुआ है।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को इस का नाम दर्ज करने बारे कोई उजर हो तो वह तिथि 3-2-93 समय 10 बजे प्रातः स्वयं या किसी वान्छित के माध्यम से हमारे समक्ष अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश करें अन्यथा एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

अतः इस नोटिस द्वारा समस्त जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को इस का नाम दर्ज करने बारे कोई उजर हो तो वह तिथि 3-2-93 समय 10 बजे प्रातः स्वयं या किसी वान्छित के माध्यम से हमारे समक्ष अदालत में हाजिर आकर पेश करें अन्यथा एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 1-1-93 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

प्यार चन्द वाहड़ी,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, रक्कड़,
सब-तहसील रक्कड़, जिला कांगड़ा।

आज दिनांक 1-1-93 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

नाम परिवर्तन

मैं, धनपत सिंह सपुत्र श्री नारायण सिंह, गांव बडश, डाकघर ए० जी०, शिमला-3 तहसील, व जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश ने अपना नाम बदल कर अजय कुमार रख लिया है। कृपया सभी नोट करे।

मोहर।

प्यार चन्द वाहड़ी,
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, रक्कड़,
सब-तहसील रक्कड़, जिला कांगड़ा।

अजय कुमार,
गांव बडश, डाकघर ए० जी०, शिमला-3,
तहसील व जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश।

भाग 6—भारतीय राजपत्र इत्यादि से से पुनः प्रकाशन

शून्य

भाग 7—भारतीय निर्वाचन आयोग (Election Commission of India) की वैधानिक अधिसूचनाएं तथा अन्य निर्वाचन सम्बन्धी अधिसूचनाएं

शून्य

अनुपूरक

शून्य